JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

VOLUME VII, Part 1.
(July 1932)

Amaravati Sculpture depicting a Stupa.

1932.

RAJAHMUNDRY.

Printed at the Razan Electric Press.

Published by the Andhra Historical Research Society.

Annual Subscription for Members: Indian 3 Rs. Foreign 6 Shillings.

" " for Institutions: Indian 6 Rs. Foreign 12 Sh.

Price of Each Part Rs. 2 only. Postage Extra 8 Annas.

CONTENTS.

1. *The Geneology and Chronology of the Pallavas.* 1—16
M. Govind Pai.

2. *Mr. Vansittart's Mission to Mir Qasim 1762.* 17—30
Nandalal Chatterji.

3. *Tekkali Rock Inscriptions of Padmachandra Deb.* 31—32
Sri Lakshminarayan Harichandan Jagadeb.

4. *The Revenue Administration of the Northern Sircars.* 33—48
Dr. Lanka Sundaram, M.A., Ph.D., (LONDON) F.R.E.S.

5. *The Political History of the Kakatiyas.* 49—56
M. Rama Rao, B.A. (HONS.) B.Ed.

6. *The History of the Eastern Gañgas of Kalinga.* 57—64
R. Subba Rao, M.A. L.T.

7. *Reviews* 65

(a) *Rock-cut Temples around Bombay.*
By K. H. Vakil.

(b) *J. A. H. R. S. Vol. VI P. I.*
By F. J. Richards, I.C.S., C.I.E.

8. *Accounts for the Quarter.* 66

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Volume VII. July 1932. Part 1.

GENEOLOGY AND CHRONOLOGY OF THE PALLAVAS.

(From Kalabhartri to Paramesvara varma II)

GOVIND PAI.

PALLAVA GENEOLOGY.

From the Omgodu (No. 1)[1] plates, we have the following Pallava pedigree.

Kumaravishnu
|
Skandavarma
|
Viravarma
|
Vijaya-Skandavarma.

From the Mangalur,[2] Pikira[3] and Omgodu (No. 2)[4] plates, we have

Viravarma
|
Skandavarma
|
Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa
|
Simhavarma

1. M. E. R. 1916 (p. 113).
2. I. A. (V. p, 154)
3. E. I. (VIII. p. 159)
4. M.E.R. 1916 (p. 114)

We know from the records of that age that the names *Vijaya Siva* and sometimes *Vijaya Siva* were used alternatively perhaps as honorific prefixes with hardly any difference of meaning with the personal name of the same king[5] as will soon be evident when we shall see that *Vijaya*-Vishnugopa (II) of the Chura plates is identical with Vishnugopa (II) of the Guntur plates, and *Vijaya*-Buddhavarma of the British museum plates is identical with Buddhavarma of the Chendalur plates. Consequently, we can easily and correctly identify Vijaya-Skandavarma of the Omgodu (No. 1) plates with Śkandavarma of the Mangalur, Pikira and Omgodu (No. 2) plates, as in each case the father's name is Viravarma.

Consolidating these two pedigrees, we have the following table.

Kumaravishnu
|
Skandavarma (I)
|
Viravarma
|
Skandavarma (II)
(*alias* Vijaya-Skandavarma)
|
Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa
|
Simhavarma ... ... A.

Now the Uruvapalli plates,[6] which give the following geneology:—

Skandavarma
|
Viravarma
|
Skandavarma
|
Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa
(*donor*)

and which record a grant of Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa are dated in the 11th regnal year of Simhavarma. Simhavarma must therefore be the then reigning king, under whom the donor Vishnugopa was the crown-prince (Yuvamaharaja). But we know that Simhavarma could not be the father of Vishnugopa, who, as is apparent from this grant itself (as well as the Mangalur, Pikira and Omgodu No. 2 plates) was the son of Skandavarma (*alias* Vijaya-Skandavarma). So the only possible alternative is that Simhavarma was the elder brother of the donor crown-

5. We have similar instances in the early Kadamba records. Mrigesavarma is named as *Vijayasiva* Mrigesavarma (I. A. VII p. 37); Krishnavarma II as *Vijayasiva* Krishnavarma (E.C. Bl. 245) &c.

6. I. A, (V. p, 50)

prince Vishnugopa. The Uruvapalli geneology then will have to be extended by the addition of Simhavarma's name, and when thereafter it is consolidated with the above table A. it would stand thus :—

Kumaravishnu
|
Skandavarma (I)
|
Viravarma
|
Skandavarma (II)
(*alias* Vijaya-Skandavarma)
|
Simhavarma (I) — Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa
Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa
|
Simhavarma (II) ... ... B.

Thus, the uniform descent in one line from Kumaravishnu to Skandavarma (II) splits into two branches with the latter's sons Simhavarma (I) and Yuva Maharaja Vishnugopa.

Then, we have the Guntur plates[7] aud the Chura plates[8] which give :—

Guntur.

Kandavarma
|
Maharaja Vishnugopavarma
|
Simhavarma
|
Vishnugopavarma

Chura.

Skandavarma
|
Maharaja Vishnugopavarma
|
Simhavarma
|
Vijaya-Vishnugopavarma.

Whence we can easily make out that Skandavarma and Kandavarma are one and the same person, as *Kanda* is merely a vulgar or vernacular variant of the Sanskrit name *Skanda*, and also that Vishnugopavarma, the 4th name in the Guntur plates is identical with *Vijaya*-Vishnugopavarma, the 4th name in the Chura plates, as prefix *Vijaya* occurring in the latter name is merely honorific, as we have already seen. Further, we infer from both of these sets of plates, which mention Vishnugopavarma (the 2nd name in both of these sets) as a *Mahārāja* that he must have actually ruled as king, and our inference is confirmed by the fact that the said Vishnugopa (I) has been placed in the regular list of actual kings in the Kasakudi plates[9] as well as the Vayalur pillar inscription.[10] Consequently the misnomer *Yuvamahārāja* Vishnugopa of the Mangalur, Pikira and Omgodu (No. 2) plates of his own son Simhavarma (II),

7. M.E.R. 1912 (p. 82) 8. M.E.R. 1914 (p. 82)
9 S. I. I. (II. p. 342) 10 E. I. (XVIII. pp. 145—52)

which is likely to mislead to the conclusion that the said Vishnugopa was a life-long crown-prince and never ruled as king has to be rejected as evidently a mistake of the composer or the engraver of those plates, due perhaps to his ignorance or inadvertance.

The table B therefore has to be extended in its right-hand side with the additional geneology furnished by the Guntur and the Chura plates, when it would stand:—

Kumaravishnu
|
Skandavarma I.
|
Viravarma
|
Skandavarma II.
|
Simhavarma I — Vishnugopa I
|
Simhavarma II
|
Vishnugopa II ... ... C.

The Udayendiram (No. 1)[11] grant of Nandivarma gives:—

Skandavarma
|
Simhavarma
|
Skandavarma
|
Nandivarma

The first two steps of this pedigree are exactly the same as the 4th and 5th steps of the table C, whence it is evident that the lineage mentioned in this Udayendiram (No. 1) grant is only an extension of the senior or left-hand side branch of Simhavarma I, and this is confirmed by the geneology given in the fragment G of the Vayalur pillar inscription, which is as follows:—

Viravarma
|
Skandavarma
|
Simhavarma
|
Skandavarma
|
Nandivarma

11. E. I. (III. p. 42)

When therefore the table C is extended in its left-hand side by the addition of these names, it would stand thus:—

Kumaravishnu
|
Skandavarma I
|
Viravarma
|
Skandavarma II
|

Simhavarma I	Vishnugopa I
|	|
Skandavarma III	Simhavarma II
|	|
Nandivarma	Vishnugopa II ... ... D.

In the Velurpalaiyam plates,[12] it is said that after Buddhavarma several kings passed away including Vishnugopa before Nandivarma was born. This Vishnugopa therefore must be the *second* king of that name, in that, whereas none else of those several kings that passed away before Nandivarma has been mentioned, not even Nandivarma's own father Skandavarma III (though according to the Udayendiram No.1 plates, we know he did rule as king), Vishnugopa alone has been mentioned by name. Wherefore the only possible conclusion is that he must have been the immediate predecessor of Nandivarma and his name has been accordingly mentioned immediately before that of his successor Nandivarma. Between Vishnugopa_I and Nandivarma, at least 2 kings must have reigned, viz. Skandvarma III the father of Nandivarma, and Simhavarma II the son of Vishnugopa I and the uncle of Nandivarma, whereas between Vishnugopa II and Nandivarma, who were cousin-brothers as is quite apparent, there is no room for even a single other name. It may be objected that as we are informed from the said plates (several kings including) Vishnugopa had *passed away before* Nandivarma was *born*, the particular Vishnugopa mentioned in these plates could not be the immediate predecessor of Nandivarma, but must be some remote king. Wherefore he would most likely be the first king of that name *i.e.* Vishnugopa I who was the Grand-uncle of Nandivarma, But if we would just move a few lines above in the same pedigree, we would find that Kumaravishnu is said to have been *born after* Skandasishya, whereas, as we shall soon see, Kumaravishnu was the son as well as the immediate successor of Skandasishya. Evidently, therefore, the particular Vishnugopa, who has been mentioned before Nandivarma in

12 M. E. R. 1911 (p. 58)

these plates, could not but be the immediate predecessor of the latter, and therefore must be Vishnugopa II. It is perhaps because Vishnugopa II was Nandivarma's senior in age that he ruled before Nandivarma, though the latter was apparently the senior in rank, as he was descended from the senior branch.

It is further stated in the same plates that after this Nandivarma *came* Simhavarma, from whom was *born* the victorious Simhavishnu. From these statements, it is clear that Simhavarma was not the son of Nandivarma, but was undoubtedly his immediate successor, as no break in succession has been indicated between them and also that Simhavishnu was the son as well as the immediate successor of Simhavarma. This Simhavarma, therefore, must have sprung from the collateral branch (*i.e.* the junior branch of Nandivarma's cousin-brother and immediate predecessor Vishnugopa II, and must also be the son of Vishnugopa II, as is confirmed by the fact that his name stands between those of Vishnugopa and Simhavishnu in the fragment H of the Vayalur pillar inscription. The geneolgy found in this fragment (H) further extends as follows:—

Vishnugopa
|
Simhavishnu
|
Mahendravarma I
|
Narasimhavarma
|
Mahendravarma II
|
Paramesvara potavarma
|
Rajasimha.

Comparing this with the lineage of Simhavishnu as given in the Udayendiram (No. 2) plates,[13] we get the following:—

Simhavishnu
|
Mahendravarma I
|
Narasimhavarma I
|
Mahendravarma II
|
Paramesvaravarma I
|
Narasimhavarma II
|
Paramesvaravarma II

13. S. I. I. (II, pp. 361-74) This geneology goes yet a step further, but for the purposes of this article, we stop with Paramesvaravarma II.

We can easily make out that Paramesvarapotavarma of the Vayalur inscription is identical with Paramesvaravarma I, and that Rajasimha of that inscription was also known as Narasimhavarma II. Now the exact filiation between Mahendravarma II and his successor Paramesvaravarma I has to be conclusively determined as in the Kasakudi plates it is said that Narasimhavarma I's son was Mahendravarma II, and then there came Paramesvarapotavarma *i. e.* Paramesvaravarma I. This, when strengthened by the fact that the name of Mahendravarma II has been entirely omitted between those of Narasimhavarma I and Paramesvaravarma I in the Velurpalaiyam plates, is likely to lead to the suspicion that Paramesvaravarma I could not be the son of Mahendravarma II, but might be a brother.[14] But if we would just remember that both the Kasakudi and the Velurpalaiyam plates[15] are much later records than the times of Mahendravarma II as well as Paramesvaravarma I, and at the same time would also believe the grantor Paramesvaravarma I himself, who in his own Kuram plates[16] distinctly says that he is *the son of* Mahendravarma II, which fiiliation is again confirmed in the Vayalur pillar inscriptions (fragment H) of Paramesvaravarma I's own son Rajasimha alias Narasimhavarma II, all the doubt will at once be cleared.

The above table D will have now to be further extended in the lineage of Vishnugopa II, when it would stand thus :—

Kumaravishnu
|
Skandavarma I
|
Viravarma
|
Skandavarma II

Simhavarma I	Vishnugopa I
Skandavarma III	Simhavarma II
Nandivarma	Vishnugopa II
	Simhavarma III

14 H. P. G. (Notes, p. 13).

15 It may also be remembered here that according to the Velurpalaiyam plates Narasimhavarma II was the son's son (पुत्रसूनु) of Paramesvaravarma I, whereas according to all the other records, including even the Kasakudi plates, the father and the former were father and son.

16 S. I. I. (I. pp. 144—55)

Simhavishnu
|
Mahendravarma I
|
Narasimhavarma I
alias Narasimhavishnu I
|
Mahendravarma II
|
Paramesvaravarma I
|
Narasimhavarma II
(*alias* Narasimhavishnu II
alias Rajasimha)
|
Paramesavarma II ... E.
(*alias* Mahendravarma III)

It may be noted here that (1) Mahendravarma I is called in the Vallam cave inscription[17] by the *birudas* of *Lalitānkura*, *Śatru malla*, *Gunabhara*; (2) Narasimhavarma I is also known as *Narasimha-vishnu* I in the Badami rock-inscription (I. A. Vol. IX. p. 99; and F. K. D. pp. 328—29); (3) Paramesvaravarma I is called by the name *Ugradanda* in the Rajasimesvara shrine inscription,[18] and also as *Lōkaditya* in the Kailasanatha temple inscription[19]; (S. I. I. Vol. I. pp. 22—23), and as *Rajasimha* in the Kailasanatha temple inscription, Rajasimheshvara shrine inscription, Panamalai inscription[20] and the Vayalur pillar inscription; (5) Paramesvaravarma II is also called *Mahendra* III in the Kailasanatha temple inscription; and (6) both the Parameswaravarmas have been called Paramesvara*pota*varmas in the Kasakudi plates.

In the Omgodu (No. 1) plates of Vijaya-Skandavarma *alias* Skandavarma II, it is said their great-grandfather Kumaravishnu performed the *Asvamedha* sacrifice. No other king between Kumaravishnu and Paramesvaravarma II is known to have performed an *Asvamedha*, nor is there any evidence of any predecessors of Kumaravishnu having performed it. But in the Prakrit Hirahadagalli plates[22] issued

17 S. I. I. (II, p. 340) 18 Ibid (I. p. 12)
19 Ibid (I. p. 22) 20 M. E. R. 1916 (p. 114)
21 From such expressions as 'यथावदाहृताश्वमेधानां पल्लवानाम्' of the Uruvapalli plates (I. A. V. p. 50) of Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa, or 'सम्राजामश्वमेधावभृथविरजसां भूभुजां पल्लवानाम्' of the Panamalai inscription of Rajasimha (M. A. R. 1916, p. 114; Q. J. M. S. XIII. 2. p. 575) & e, it would naturally look as if every one of their predecessors had performed the *Asvamedha*, but it is never so; for that and similar other great sacrifices have been from time immemorial looked upon as conferring lasting merit not only upon the immediate doer, but also upon all his past and future generations, and these expressions therefore are a

from Kanchi (Conjeevaram), the donor, king Sivaskandavarma claims to have performed several different sacrifices including the *Aśvamēdha*. It is therefore certain that Kumaravishnu and Sivaskandavarma are but two different names of one and the same king, who performed the *Aśvamēdha*. Next, there is another Prakrit charter known as the Mayidavolu plates,[23] which was also issued from Kanchi by the crown-prince (Yuvamaharaja) Sivaskandavarma in the 10th year of the reign of his father, whose name has not been mentioned. Now from the 3 fragments B. C. and D of the Vayalur pillar inscription, we have the following:—

B.	C.	D.
Kalabhartri		
Chuta-Pallava		
Virakurcha	Virakurcha	
	Skandavarma	Skandavarma
	Kumaravishnu	Kumaravishnu
	Buddhavarma	Buddhavarma

Whence it is evident that Kumaravishnu was the grandson of Virakurcha. This Kumaravishnu therefore must be the grantor of the Darsi plates[24] which were issued by the grandson of Virakurcha. Now the Darsi plates are in Sanskrit, wherefore it goes without saying that the transition, from the use of Prakrit to that of Sanskrit in the Pallava inscriptions, had already set in the reign of Kumaravishnu *alias* Sivaskandavarma, whose Hirahadagalli plates issued in his 8th regnal year are, as we have seen, a Prakrit charter. It therefore stands to reason that the Mayidavolu plates, which are a Prakrit charter, cannot be assigned to any date later than that of Kumaravishnu, and as the grantor thereof the crown-prince Sivaskandavarma bears the same name as the donor king Sivaskandavarma of the Hirahadagalli plates, they may be correctly identified with each other as one and the some person, when it would be seen that he

means of claiming that merit before the world for all the posterity of the original performer of those sacrifices, wherefore (it may be noted) all these expressions are in the plural. Similar expressions are also found in the early Kadamba records, e. g. the Nilambur plates of Ravivarma (E. I. VIII. p 13), the Tagare plates of Bhogivarma (M. A. R. 1918; p. 35), the Shimoga plates of Mandhata Raja (Ibid. 1911; p. 32) &c.

22 E. I. (I. p. 2)

23 Ibid (VI. pp. 84—89)

24 Ibid (I. p. 397)

issued the former while he was yet a crown-prince, and the latter, dated in his 8th regnal year, after he had already become king.

Now, from the 3 pedigrees obtained from the fragments B. C. and D of the Vayalur inscription, we can readily draw up this consolidated geneology of those early Pallavas:—

Kalabhartri
|
Chuta-Pallava
|
Virakurcha
|
Skandavarma
|
Kumaravishnu
|
Buddhavarma

The same six regular steps in the early Pallava succession are thus given without any break in the Velurpalaiyam plates :—

Kalabhartri
|
Chuta-Pallava
|
Virakurcha
|
Skandasishya
|
Kumaravishnu
|
Buddhavarma

Comparing these 2 pedigrees, we can easily and correctly identify Skandavarma of the former inscription with Skandasishya of the latter.

The Chendalur plates[25] carry this geneology a step further:—

Skandavarma
|
Kumaravishnu I
|
Buddhavarma
|
Kumaravishnu II

So, with the addition of the last name of Kumaravishnu II of these plates, the early geneology from Kalabhartri would stand thus:—

25 E. I, (VIII. p. 233.)

Kalabhartri
|
Chuta-Pallava
|
Virakurcha
|
Skandasishya
(*alias* Skandavarma)
|
Kumaravishnu I
(*alias* Sivaskandavarma)
|
Buddhavarma
|
Kumaravishnu II

Thus, it is evident that Kumaravishnu I, who as we have seen, is identical with Sivaskandavarma of the Mayidavolu as well as the Hirahadagalli plates, was the father of Buddhavarma. But from the British Museum Prakrit plates,[26] which give Vijaya-Skandavarma and his son Yuvamaharaja Vijaya-Buddhavarma, we are informed that Vijaya-Buddhavarma was the son of the then reigning king Vijaya-Skandavarma, and this grant was issued by Charu-devi, the wife of that crown-prince. We have already seen that *Siva*, *Vijaya* and *Vijaya-Siva* were used as mere honorific prefixes added to the personal names of the kings, and as such the same king would be known as Sivaskandavarma, Vijayaskandavarma and Vijayasivaskandavarma without his identity being impaired in the least. We have also seen that in the composition of the Pallava inscriptions Prakrit was replaced by Sanskrit in the reign of Kumaravishnu *alias* (Sivaskandavarma), wherefore the British Museum Prakrit plates must have been issued in the reign of Kumaravishnu, and *a priori* Vijaya-Skandavarma of those plates is identical with Sivaskandavarma of the Hirahadagalli plates, *i. e.* with Kumaravishnu, and Vijaya-Buddhavarma is the same as Buddhavarma of the Chendalur and the Velurpalaiyam plates, and of the Vayalur pillar inscription. Consequently, this earlier part of the Pallava Geneology would now stand thus: —

Kalabhartri
|
Chuta-Pallava
|
Virakurcha
|

26. E. I. (VIII p. 143)

Skandasishya
(*alias* Skandavarma)
|
Kumaravishnu I
(*alias* Sivaskandavarma,
alias Vijayaskandavarma)
|
Buddhavarma
(*alias* Vijaya-Buddhavarma)
|
Kumaravishnu II .... F.

Comparing the last 3 steps of this table F with the first 3 steps of the previous table E, we find that Buddhavarma of this table is identical with Skandavarma I of that table, and also that Kumaravishnu II of this table is identical with Viravarma of that, and further that the connecting link between these two tables is Vijaya-Skandavarma *alias* Skandavarma II, whose name stands fourth in that table, and who therefore becomes Skandavarma III.

Consolidating both of these tables E and F, we get the final Geneology of the Pallavas from Kalabhartri to Paramesvaravarma II, as follows :—

1 Kalabhartri
|
2 Chuta-Pallava
|
3 Virakurcha
|
4 Skandasishya
(*alias* Skandavarma I)
|
5 Kumaravishnu I
(*alias* Sivaskandavarma
alias Vijayaskandavarma)
|
6 Buddhavarma
(*alias* Vijaya-Buddhavarma
alias Skandavarma II
|
7 Viravarma (*alias* Kumaravishnu II
|
8 Skandavarma III
(*alias* Vijayaskandavarma)

9 Simhavarma I
|
11 Skandavarma IV
|
14 Nandivarma

10 Vishnugopa I
|
12 Simhavarma II
|
13 Vishnugopa II
|

15 Simhavarma III
|
16 Simhavishnu
|
17 Mahendravarma I
|
18 Narasimhavarma I
|
19 Mahendravarma II
|
20 Paramesvaravarma I
|
21 Narasimhavarma II
|
22 Paramesvaravarma II
(*alias* Mahendravarma III)

There is a short inscription of a single verse engraved on one of the pillars of a cave on the Melaicheri hill, which is dedicated to God Siva under the name of Sikhari Pallavesvara; and it runs thus —

कारितमिदं नृपतिना चन्द्रादित्येन सार्वभौमेन।

श्री शिखरिपल्लवेश्वरमिति शैवं धाम सिंहपुरे ॥[27]

This inscription is said to be engraved in a script dating between the reigns of Mahendra I and Rajasimha (*i. e.* Narasimhavarma II), and from the fact that the temple is called 'Sikhari *Pallaveśvara*', it is conclusive that Chandraditya must be a Pallava king, nay an Emperor as he calls himself सार्वभौम. He seems to be Narasimhavarma I, for the place has been called 'Simhapura' perhaps after his own name, and also because he is said to have conquered his contemporary Chalukya king, who was himself a very great king, and taken his capital Vatapi (Badami), as stated in the Kurma plates of his grandson Paramesvaravarma I. In that case Chandraditya would be an *alter nomen* of Narasimhavarma I.

There are two more Pallava names, the positions of the bearers of which in the Pallava geneology still remain to be determined; viz. (1) Chandadanda, whom the Kadamba king Ravivarma claims to have overturned[28] and (2) Santivara, who is said to have crowned the Kadamba king Vishnuvarma, as stated in the latter's Hebbata plates.[29] The dates as well as the positions of these 2 Pallava kings will be duly discussed in our next article on the Early Kadamba Chronology.

27 M. A. R. 1916 (p. 114); Q. J. M. S. (XIII. 2. p. 574)

28 I. A. (VI. p. 29) — 'उत्सांद्य काञ्चीश्वर चण्डदण्डम् ।'

29 M. A. R. 1925 (p.98)- 'शान्तिवर महाराज पल्लवेन्द्राभिषिक्तेन श्री विष्णुवर्म महाराजेन.'

It is believed that the Anaji stone inscription[30] reveals a new and unknown Pallava name, that of Nanakkasa Pallava; but what in fact it reveals is no Pallava name, nor for that matter any proper name at all, but merely a pure and simple meslection (due to a wrong grouping of letters in the line)— **'शिवनन्दवर्मा स्वदेश क्षयेनणकास पल्लवराज कृष्णवर्म राजयोः समरे तुमुलिने (?) प्रवृत्ते कृष्णवर्मराजसैन्ये भग्ने'**, which has been consequently wrongly translated as — 'Sivanandavarma, in the ruin of his country, Krishnavarma Raja's army being overcome in the tumultuous battle which took place between Nanakkasa Pallava Raja and Krishnavarma Raja'; whereas the undoubtedly correct reading is—

'......स्वदेशक्षयेन निष्कासितः पल्लवराज कृष्णराजयोः &c.'

which means 'Sivanandavarma having lost his country and having been exiled (thence) &c', (for the word **'निष्कासित'** means 'exiled', 'driven out' &c), as we shall see in our Kadamba article where we shall discuss this inscription. It is thus the last letter **'न'** (of the instumental singular **स्वदेशक्षयेन**) and first three letters of the passive past participle **'निष्कासित'** that have brought forth a new Pallava name. This inscription therefore discloses no new Pallava name, but only refers to a decisive battle that was fought between an *unnamed* Pallava king and the Kadamba king Krishnavarma, which caused the exile of Sivanandavarma and broke his heart as is clearly expressed in it. Nanakkasa Pallava therefore may be dismissed forthwith as absolutely non-existent.

Pallava Chronology

The chronological facts so far accessible to us with regard to some of these kings are—

(1) In the Penukonda plates,[31] a Pallava king Simhavarma is said to have installed the Ganga king Ayyavarma on the Ganga throne; and in our article on the Chronology of the early Gangas[32] we have seen that Ayyavarma is the same as Harivarma, whose Tanjore and Tagadur plates are respectively dated in 313 A. C. and 314 A. C., and there we have also assigned his regnal period to 309—40 A.C. Therefore this Simhavarma must have been on the Pallava throne from before 309 A. C.

(2) In the same plates, it is further said that a Pallava king Skāndavarma installed the grantor Ganga king Madhavavarma (*alias* Simhavarma) i. e. Madhava II on the Ganga throne, and we have said in that article that the said act must have been just over before the 17th March 349 A. C., which we have found out to be the date of

30 E. C. (XI. D I. 161); Ibid (Int. p. 6); M. C. I. (p. 24)

31 E. I. (XII. p. 335) 32 K. H. R. (II, 1.)

those plates. This Skandavarma therefore must have commenced to rule sometime before 349 A. C.

(3) In the Samudragupta's Allahabad pillar inscription,[33] One Vishnugopa, King of Kanchi (wherefore a Pallava king) has been mentioned among the kings he conquered in his South Indian campaign. From the New Mathura inscription' of Samudragupta's son and successor Chandragupta II, which is dated in Gupta Samvat (G. S.) 61, and the first regnal year of Chandragupta II, it is obvious that Samudragupta must have died in G. S. 60 or 61 i. e. 332-333 A. C. according to our date 272-273 A. C. for the epoch of the Gupta era.[34] Samudragupta's South Indian expedition may therefore be located in circa 320--322 A. C., when his Pallava contemporary Vishnugopa must have already been ruling.

(4) An eclipse has been mentioned in the Omgodu (No. 2) plates[35] of Simhavarma II, the son of Vishnugopa I, which are dated in his 4th regnal year on the 5th lunar day of the bright fortnight of *Vaisakha*, wherefore the said eclipse must be a solar eclipse which occured on the just previous newmoon day of *Chaitra*, i. e. just 5 days prior to the actual date of that grant.

(5) In the copyist's colophon of a Jaina work called '*Lokavibhaga*', there occurs the verse:—[36]

संवत्सरे तु द्वाविंशे काञ्चीशा सिंहवर्मणः।
अशीत्यग्रे शावाब्दानां सिद्धमेतच्छतत्रये॥

aecording to which, his work seems to have been finished in S. S. (Saka Samvat) 380 i. e. 458—459 A. C. (*vide* appendix A.), which was also the 22nd regnal year of Simhavarma, king of Kanchi and therefore a Pallava king. This Simhavarma then must have begun to rule in 437 A.C.

(6) In the '*Avantisundari Katha*'[37] the poet Damodara is said to have repaired from the court of the Ganga king Durvinita to that of (the Pallava) king Simhavishnu at Kanchi, wherefore those two kings ought to be contemporaries. In our article on the early Ganga Chronology, we have found out that the Ganga king Durvinita came to the throne in 478 A.C. and was still ruling in 518 A.C. This contemporaneity seems to be confirmed by the Humcha stone inscription,[38] which states that when a certain Kaduvetti (i. e. Pallava) king, who was as another Ravana on the earth, thwarted the accession of Jayasimha Vallabha to the Chalukya throne, the Ganga king Durvinita, who was the maternal grandfather of Jayasimha, defeated that Pallava and installed his grandson Jayasimha on the throne of his family. As the comparision with the mythological

33 F. G. I. (No. 1,) 34 J. I. H. (xI. 2) 35 M.E. R. 1916 (p. 114)
36 M. A. R. 1910 (p. 46) 37 Avantisundari Kathasara (I. pp, 2—3)
38 E. C. (VIII, Nr. 35)

world-victor Ravana is quite appropriate in the case of Simhavishnu, who is extolled in the Kasakudi plates as the conqueror of the Malaya, Kalabhra, Malava, Chola, Pandya, Simhala and Kerala kings, and who moreover in the Velurpalaiyam plates has been mentioned with the significant epithet— the *victorious* Simhavishnu, this event has been assigned to circa 500 A. C. in our Ganga article, and Simhavishnu therefore would be already on the throne in 500 A. C.

(7) In the Kurma plates[39] of Paramesvaravarma I, it is said that his grandfather Narasimhavarma I defeated the Chalukya king Pulikesi in several battles writing the word 'victory' on his back, and took the Chalukya capital 'Vatapi' (Badami), and destroyed it; and in the Velurpalaiyam plates also Narasimhavarma I is called the conqueror of Vatapi. Narasimhavarma I and Pulikesi therefore would no doubt be contemporaries; but which of the *two* Pulikesis was the contemporary of Narasimhavarma I is still an open question, though all the scholars seem to have been agreed that the Pulikesi defeated by Narasimhavarma I is the second of that name i. e. Pulikesi II.

(8) In the Kuram plates again the grantor king Paramesvaravarma I claims to have made Vikramaditya, whose army consisted of several thousands, take to flight covered merely by a rag, which is confirmed by the Velurpalaiyam plates, in which this Paramesvaravarma I is said to be the destroyer of the Chalukya forces. This Vikramaditya is no doubt the Chalukya king Vikramaditya I, who was the son and successor of Pulikesi II. He came to the throne in 652 A. C. (*Vide* Appendix B) and ruled until 682 or 683[40] A. C. when he was succeeded by his son Vinayaditya. Thus, then, Paramesvaravarma I and Vikramaditya I were contemporaries.

(To be continued.)

39 S. I. I. (I. pp, 144—55)

40 The Lakshmeswara stone inscription (F. K. D. p. 368) is dated S. S, 609 on the full-moon day of *Magha* in the 5th regnal year of Vinayaditya, which is 2nd February 687 A. C. on which there was a lunar eclipse though not mentioned in that grant; and the Sorab plates of Alupa Chitravaha (E. C. VIII. Sb. 571) are dated S. S, 614 on Saturday the day of Summer solstice in the 11th regnal year of Vinayaditya, which is 22nd June 692 A. C. Vinayaditya, therefore, must have begun to rule in 682 or 683 A. C.

Mr. VANSITTART'S MISSION TO MIR QASIM, 1762.

NANDALAL CHATTERJI.

It was after removing his seat of government to Monghyr that the Nawab seriously turned his attention to the subject of the private inland trade of the Company's servants, and began making almost daily complaints[1] about the right of the latter to trade duty-free. Up till now the Nawab had not made his protests so vehemently, but his tone appears to have undergone a perceptible change after the transference of his headquarters from Murshidabad to Monghyr. In fact, he had, and—this is usually overlooked,— determined not to allow the private trade of the English merchants on any footing whatsoever. That he took definite steps to stop this trade is clear from the following facts:—

(i) Not long after the Nawab's arrival at Monghyr, his officers in the various districts began, ostensibly under the Nawab's orders, to stop the boats belonging to the English merchants inspite of their being 'dastaks' with them. This harassment was reported to be due to the Nawab's demand of duties even from the Company's servants. The Chief and Council at Dacca wrote in their letter dated October 8, 1762: "At every Chokey our boats are stopped, the people insulted, and the flag used with the utmost and most gross contempt."[2] The Chief and Council at Chittagong similarly wrote in their letter, dated October 14, 1762, "Our business is entirely put to a stop to, by the Nabob's people, and our boats not suffered to pass the Chokeys, the zamindars demanding very considerable duties to be paid them, declaring that they have orders from Cossim Allee Cawn so to do."[3] The Chiefs and Council at Lakhipur made[4] the very same complaint in the following words: "Within these few days, every boat which we have sent out of the river has been stopped at the different Chokeys, notwithstanding they have the Chiefs' 'dustuck'". In short, such complaints were received from every district. The Faujdar of Katwa was at this time reported to have stopped 150 boats belonging to the English gentlemen, notwithstanding that these bore the Company's 'dastak'.[5] All these,

1 Vansittart's Narrative, II, p. 97. 2 Beng. Pub. Cons. Oct. 18, 1763.
3 Ben. Pub. Cons. Nov. 1, 1763. 4 Ibid.
5 Trans. P. L. I. 1762 Nos. 130, 131 & 133 (p. 25 and pp. 69—70)

therefore, clearly indicate the Nawab's settled policy to put a stop to the duty-free trade of the Company's servants.

(ii) Not only were the boats stopped for the exaction of duties, but all sorts of obstruction to the Company's trade came to be reported.[6] Ellis complained of the interference of the local Amil with the weavers and bleachers in their business at Jahanabad.[7] The Chiefs of Dacca, Lakhipur, and Chittagong also drew the attention of the Council at Calcutta to the unprecedented ill-treatment of their subordinates, and Mr. Vansittart formally protested against it to the Naib, and the Faujdar of Dacca more than once.[8] The Chief and Council at Dacca further represented[9] in their letter, dated October 8, 1862, "... Muchalcas have been taken from many inhabitants, prohibiting them on no account to have any connections with the English." This statement is borne out by the author of the Muzaffar-Namah, who too states[10] that the Nawab's 'ziladars' were instructed to direct the 'ryots' not to have any dealings with the English. The Nawab must have supposed that by this means he would be able to hamper the private trade of the English, and force them ultimately to pay the regular duties.

(iii) The practice of the Company's servants to issue 'dastaks' indiscriminately was galling to the Nawab, and he wanted to get it abolished. Early in August, 1762, he wrote to the Governor complaining that too many people had begun issuing 'dastaks'[11] whereupon the Governor informed him,[12] on September 3, that the gentlemen who had been authorised to issue 'dastaks' were Mr. Batson of Cossimbazar, Mr. Cartier of Decca, Mr. Billiers of Lakhipur, Mr. Verelst of Islamabad, Mr. Ellis of Patna, and Mr. Gray of Malda. It was just this information which the Nawab needed, because he was bent upon putting down the circulation of the dastaks issued by all other English merchants.[13]

(iv) That the Nawab suddenly multiplied the number of customs—stations in the country is a significant step. They were not only to be a source of additional income to the Government, but were specially intended to be an effective impediment to the private trade of the

6 Third Report, 1773. pp. 335—36.

7 Beng. Pub. Cons. Oct. 18, 1762, Trans. P. L. I. 1762. No. 141 p. 75.

8 Vansittart's Narrative II, p. 127 and Trans. P. L. I. 1762, Nos. 142, 144, 145, pp. 75—77.

9 Beng. Pub. Cons. Oct. 18, 1762.

10 Muzaffar-Namah (Alld. Univ. Ms pp. 333)

11 Abs. P. L. R. 1759—65, p. 14.

12 Trans. P. L. I. 1762. No. 128. p. 68.

13 "A defence of Mr. Vansittart's conduct in concluding the treaty of commerce with Mhir Cossim Aly Chawn." By a servant of the company long resident in Bengal. 1764. p. 9.

English. New stations were established in places where there had been none before, and although the Governor had earnestly requested[14] the Nawab to close these new 'Chaukis' no heed seems to have been paid to it. Besides stationing additional 'Chaukis', the Nawab augmented the force at every customs station so that the English boats might be systematically stopped.[15]

While the Company's servants loudly protested against this deliberate and sudden obstruction to their private trade, the Nawab made equally bitter complaints against their highhandedness, and that of their 'gumashtahs'. New charges were brought against them by the Nawab, and these may be thus summarised:—

(i) The Nawab wrote[16] to the Governor in May, 1762: "And this is the way your gentlemen behave; they make a disturbance all over my country, plunder the people, injure and disgrace my servants, with a resolution to expose my government to contempt; and from the borders of Hindostan to Calcutta, make it their business to expose me to scorn." It is too sweeping a charge to deserve any elaborate examination, and is a characteristic instance of the Nawab's exaggerated denunciations.

(ii) The recent increase in the number of the Company's factories was bitterly criticised by the Nawab in the following words,[17] "Near four, or five hundred new factories have been established in my dominions, and it is impossible to express what disturbances are made in every factory, and how the inhabitants are oppressed". The addition of factories was due partly to the increasing volume of the private trade of the English, and the Governor in his letter[18] to the Nawab, dated April 23, 1762, rightly argued that commerce had lately increased owing to greater security, and that the prosperity of the country would be still further enhanced by this increasing trade. The Nawab agreed with the Governor, and replied, "It is true that by the flourishing of trade, and the free intercourse of merchants, a country is rendered populous."[19] That, in spite of this admission, he went on complaining against the increase in the number of factories was due to his innate hatred of the privileged position of the English merchants.

(iii) The rapacity of the company's 'gumashtahs' was the most serious charge. There is, however, sufficient evidence to prove that they

14 Trans. P. L. I. 1761, No. 429. p. 217
15 Beng. Pub. Cons. Nov. 1. 1762.
16 Abs. P. L. R. 1759—65, p. 13. Vansittart's Narrative, II, pp. 97-102
17 Ibid
18 Trans. P. L. I. 1762. No. 65. p. 39.
19 Narrative, II. p. 102.

did flagrantly abuse[20] the authority and protection of their inexperienced, or ignorant masters. The Nawab wrote about the gumashtahs, as follows; "......the gomastahs who have gone into the country on the part of your gentlemen, regardless of what any one says to them, insolently use violent means to carry on their traffick, and whenever a gunge, or golah has been established. they act as zemindars, taalookdars, and renters, and leave my officers no authority; and besides this, they send other people's goods with their own, under the protection of their dustucks".[21] This allegation was substantially correct. In fact, the 'gumashtahs' were generally a set of the worst rascals whose oppressive conduct was an open scandal. Their masters usually supported them because they believed that their agents had to commit acts of violence in self-defence on account of the opposition of the Nawab's people. Assured of sympathy and assistance, the English agents practised the worst tyranny wherever they went. They forced the ryots to sell their goods below the market rate, and purchase the commodities they had brought at an exorbitant price.[22] They forcibly exacted large presents from the people, and thus plundered them under this pretence. They sold dastaks to private merchants at a price,[23] and the latter thus freely evaded the payment of the duties. Sergeant Brego who had been sent to Backergunje by the Governor to arrest the gumashtahs accused of having created disturbances wrote[25] on May 25, 1762, "A gentleman sends a gomastah here to buy or sell; he immediately looks upon himself as sufficient to force every inhabitant, either to buy his goods, or sell him theirs, and on refusal a flogging, or confinement immediately ensues ...... Before, justice was given in the public cutcherree, but now every gomastah is become a judge, and every one's house a cutcherree; they even pass sentences on the zemindars themselves, and draw money from them by pretended injuries........" The Faujdar of Dacca wrote[26] to the Governor in September 1762, "........the gomastahs of Luckypoor and Dacca factories oblige the merchants etc., to take tobacco, cotton, iron, and sundry other things, at a price exceeding that of the bazaar, and then extort the money from them by force; besides which they take

20 Beng. Pub. Cons. 17th Jan. 1763 (vide letter from Ganga Ram Mittra to Mr. Taxeira)

Beng. Pub. Cons. 1st Feb. 1763 (vide letter from Vansittart to Johnstone, Hay, Bolts, dated Dec. 15, 1762)

21 Vansittart's Narrative, II, p, 102.

22 Ibid, p. 104.

23 Verelsts "A view of English Government in Bengal" p. 8.

24 Trans· P. L. I. 1762. No. 109. p. 58

25 Beng Pub. Cons. 18th Oct. 1762

26 Abs. P. L. R. 1759—65, p. 32.

diet money for the peons, and make them pay a fine for breaking their agreement. By these proceedings, the aurangs and other places are ruined, The gomastahs of Luckypoor factory have taken the taalookdars' taalooks from the tahsildar by force for their own use, and will not pay the rent. By these disturbances the country is ruined, and the reiats cannot stay in their houses, nor pay the malguzarree". The Amil of Purnea similarly complained against the gumashtahs, and represented that the latter impeded the public business,[27] Mr. Hastings while on his way to Sasseram wrote to the Governor from Bhagalpur on April 25, 1762.[28] "I beg leave to lay before you a grievance which calls loudly for redress, and will, unless duly attended to, render inaffectual any endeavours to create a firm or lasting harmony between the Nawab and the Company; I mean the oppressions committed under the sanction of the English name......... This evil, I am well assured, is not confined to our dependents alone, but is practised all over the country by people falsely assuming the habits of our sepoys, or calling themselves our gomastahs." Mr. Verelst observes,[29] "English agents, or gomastahs, not contented with injuring the people, trampled on the authority of the government, binding and punishing the Nabob's officers, wherever they presumed to interfere". In short, it is clear that the insolent tyranny of the gumashtahs, exaggerated though it might have been, was a fact, and it was due to a number of reasons.

In the first place, they were often obliged to have recourse to violence in defence of their privileges in those distant parts of the province where the Nawab's government had not been well established,[30] In the second place, a number of clever merchants fraudulently posed as the company's agents in the interior of the county,[31] and carried on their nefarious activities simply under the protection of the Company's name. In the third place, the complaints made against themselves were represented by the agents to their credulous masters as a deliberate obstruction to their business, and were therefore invariably disregarded by the latter.[32] In the fourth place, they had at their disposal the armed sepoys of the factories, and thus could defy the Nawab's officials, or the subordinates of the zemindars.[33] In the fifth place, as Mr. Hastings put it, "...... the indolence of the Bengalees, or the difficulty of gaining access to those who might do them justice, prevents

27 Abs. P. L. R, 1759—65, p. 31.
28 Gleig's memoirs, I. p. 107.
29 Verelst's "A view of English government in Bengal" p. 46.
30 Mr. Vansittart himself admits this fact, (Narrative II, p. 151)
31 Letter from Mr, Hastings to the Governor (Narrative II. p. 80.)
32 Beng. Pub. Cons. 18th Oct. 1762.
33 Letter from the Faujdar of Dacca Abs. P. L R. 1759—65. p. 15.

our having knowledge of the oppressions, and encourages their continuance. to the great, though unmerited scandal of our government."[34] In the sixth place, it was not unusual for a young writer to be engaged in a joint trade[35] with these crafty gumashtahs who supplied the capital, and gave a share of the profits to their sleeping partners whose only duty was to issue dastaks. Sure of the support of their English partners who were obviously dominated by their clever agents, the latter could safely tyrannise over the ryots, and weavers, and coerce the public servants. The Nawab complained that these gumashtahs even refused to show their dastaks to his officials out of sheer arrogance.[36] In the seventh place, the gumashtahs had sometimes to take the law into their own hands, when the Nawab's officials who were perfectly aware of their master's animosity against the English merchants maliciously obstructed them in their business. Cases of such unwarranted interference by the Nawab's officials were certainly not infrequent, and were regularly brought to the notice of the Nawab.[37]

(iv) Another ground of complaint against the gentlemen of the factories was their practice of giving loans to the zemindars or to the "mutasaddis" of the Nawab. The latter strongly urged[38] the Governor to stop this practice as it impeded the work of revenue collection. The Nawab particularly criticised the attitude of the gentlemen at Dacca, who had been alleged to have obstructed the collection of revenue by sending their men to the aid of the zemindars.[39]

(v) The next argument against the English merchants was that they had begun to rent markets, or 'golas', and establish new ones by force. This was true to a certain extent only, and was often due to the instigation of the gumashtahs. The Nawab particularly complained against Mr. Chevalier of Dacca who was reported to have oppressed the people by forcibly establishing new markets, factories, and 'chaukis'.[40]

(vi) Finally, the Nawab took exception to the English merchants trading in certain articles like salt, tobacco, etc., which he referred to as a breach of the Company's firman.[41] In fact, the whole of the private trade of the Company's servants was suddenly regarded by the Nawab as an unauthorised and illegal innovation.

34 Gleigs memoirs, I. p. 108
35 "A defence of Mr. Vansittart's conduct" p. 9.
36 Trans. P. L, R. Jan-Sept. 1763, No. 7, p. 6.
37 Vansittart's Narrative, II, pp. 147—50, Trans. P. L. I. 1762 Nos. 144 & 142. Beng, Pub. Cons. 18th Oct. & 1st Nov. 1762
38 Abs. P. L. R. 1759—65, pp. 14—15.
39 Ibid, p, 15
40 Ibid, p. 14 and Narrative II, p. 117
41 Narrative, II, p. 142

At length, the disputes, arising out of the private trade of the English gentlemen, became so serious and frequent that a rupture between the Nawab and the Company seemed to be imminent. Camplaints, and counter-complaints from the officers of the government, and the gentlemen of the factories fast multiplied. The only alternative to a war with the Nawab was a compromise which would be mutually acceptable, and a compromise could be reached only through a personal interview between the Nawab, and Mr. Vansittart. The latter therefore decided to pay a visit to the Nawab at Monghyr, and settle the points at issue amicably. He had also been lately anxious to obtain a change of air after his recent illness,[42] and so he readily accepted the pressing invitation of the Nawab to come to Monghyr.[43] "I flattered myself", Mr. Vansittart writes[44], "this would prove an effectual method of re-establishing a confidence between us, putting an end to the disputes, which had arisen, and providing a plan for the security of the provinces against foreign enemies." With Mr. Hastings as his assistant, he set out from Calcutta on the 20th October, and after staying for a few days at Murshidabad, he arrived at Monghyr on the 30th of November, 1762.[45] The Governor was accorded a magnificent reception by the Nawab who went to receive his honoured guests at the garden of Goderrgatta (about six miles from Monghyr), and with the utmost honour escorted them to the town, where a splendid building on the hill of Sita-kund, and a number of fine tents were set apart for their residence.[46] Then followed ceremonial visits, and grand entertainments almost every day. The Nawab offered costly presents to his guest who too complimented the former with some rich presents that he had brought with him.[47] The festivities organised in honour of the guest were on a sumptuous scale, and Mr. Vansittart and his party were treated "with all the usual marks of respect and friendship". The principal topic of conversation was the Nawab's complaints against the alleged ill-treatment that he had received from Mr. Ellis and others. The Nawab next complained of the abuses of the private trade of the English gentlemen.[49] The points specially stressed by him were as follows:—

42 Narrative, II, p. 130

43 The Nawab had sent his invitation early in June, but Mr. Vansittart had to postpone his departure. Trans. P, L. I 1762, No. 99, p. 54

44 Narrative, II, p. 130 45 Ibid, p. 144.

"Thursday of Zamadiul Awwal 1176" according to Siyar, (Lucknow Text p 715). "Fifth of Zamadiul Awwal according to Khulasat (J.B.O.R.S, V. p. 606)

46 Siyar, p. 716 47 Ibid 48 Ibid and Narrative II, P. 141

49 Narrative II, pp. 142—144; Siyar, p. 716; Khulasat (J.B.O.R.S. V p, 607) Muzaffar Namah (Alld. Univ. MS) p, 336; Tarikh-i-Muzaffari (Alld, Univ. MS) p, 780; Vansittart's "Letter to the Proprietors of East India Stock" p. 80 Verelst's "A view of English Government in Bengal" p, 37

(1) The private trade of the Company's servants was not covered by the Firmans of the Company;

(2) His administration was adversely affected by this trade owing to difficulty in maintaining law and order in the country;

(3) He was suffering a heavy loss in his custom duties;

(4) Under the protection of the Company's name, innumerable persons passed their goods duty-free;

(5) The prestige of his government suffered on account of the irregulartities of this trade;

(6) The Company's gumashtahs, and servants oppressed the people; and

(7) The gentlemen of the factories held farms, 'taalluqs', 'ganj's, and 'golas', borrowed from and lent to his people, afforded protection to his dependents; coined money at different places, and used force in the purchase and sale of goods.

Mr. Vansittart's position was very delicate. He did not like to offend his friend, and he had avowedly come to bring about a compromise. The Nawab, however, demanded the total abolition of the private trade of the English gentlemen, but this the Governor had no authority to assent to without the concurrence of the Council.[50] "Although I was of the same opinion", Mr. Vansittart writes,[51] with the Nawab as to the rights of the firman, that they could not be construed to extend further than the trade in articles imported by shipping, and the manufactures and products of the country for exportation, yet I was unwilling to give up an advantage which had been enjoyed by the Company's servants in a greater, or less degree for five, or six years; and therefore told the Nawab that as to the inland trade, or the trade from place to place in the country, in the articles of the produce of the country we meant only to carry it on upon the same footing with other merchants." Obviously the Governor played into the hands of the Nawab in yielding on the point of the duties, and agreeing to surrender the right of the Company's servants to trade duty-free. That he wanted to placate the stubborn Nawab is easy to understand,[52] and the reasons why he thought himself justified[53] in acquiescing in the settlement regarding the payment of duties can be gleaned from his "Narrative";—

50 Narrative, II, p. 143. 51 Ibid.

52 Letter from Vansittart to Council, Dec. 15, 1762 (Third report, 1773 app. 32, pp. 340—41)

53 "A Defence of Mr. Vansittart's Conduct" p 151

(i) "We agree with the Nawab in opinion that the true intent and natural meaning of the firman granted to the Company was to give to them, and their servants a free trade, clear of all customs, in all articles of commerce, to be imported, or exported by shipping;[54]

(ii) "It is a fact that the Nabobs of these provinces did formerly restrain the Europeans[55] from carrying on this trade upon any footing......"

(iii) "We think it would be unreasonable to desire to carry on the inland trade upon any other footing than that of the merchants of the country......"[56]

(iv) "...... I thought I was doing a great service to the English merchants by establishing a right to a trade which had always before been disputed......"[57]

(v) "......... I agreed with the Nabob that the rate of duties should be nine percent on the prime cost ...... I found this to be below the rate already paid at Luckypoor......"[58]

Mr. Vansittart went to the length of agreeing[59] to all the other proposals of the Nawab:—

(1) The Chiefs of the factories should be instructed not to oppress the ryots, and protect his dependents;

(2) The Faujdars should be permitted to try any offending gumashtahs;

(3) The Chiefs of Chittagong and Lakhipur must not work the salt-pans themselves;

(4) The Chiefs and gumashtahs of the factories should not rent, or purchase any lands, nor lend to and borrow from the zemindars, and officers of the government;

(5) The Chiefs and gumashtahs should not obstruct the 'dallals' and weavers of the government;

(6) The bullion of the English gentlemen and gumashtahs should not be coined in the Patna, the Murshidabad, and the Dacca mints, and payment of the usual 'battah' according to the market rate should be made to the money-changers; and

54 Narrative, II, p. 151 55 Ibid, p. 153
56 Narrative, II, p. 159
57 ,, ,, p. 162
58 ,, ,, p. 163
59 Beng. Pub. Cons. 17th Jan. 1762; Trans, P. L, R. Jan. Sept. No. 1 pp.1-3

(7) The gumashtahs at Gwalparah should not deal directly with the hill-men, and must make all their purchases and sales through 'daroghah' of the 'Sarkar'.

In due course, Mr. Vansittart proposed60 a number of regulations for settling the manner of carrying on the inland trade upon a satisfactory footing, and these were accepted by the Nawab after a show of reluctance. These regulations can be thus summed up:—

1st. Only the export, or import trade of the company shall be duty-free.

2nd. For the inland trade, the Company's dastak shall not be granted.

3rd. Duties should be paid according to the fixed rate on all goods meant for the inland trade.

4th. Duties shall be paid only once before the despatch of goods

5th. These goods shall not be detained after the dastak has been examined by the 'Chaukidars'.

6th. Notice shall be given to the nearest English factory as well as to the nearest officer of the government in case one attempts to pass goods without a dastak, or fraudulently use the Company's dastak, and the goods shall be confiscated.

7th. If any body attempts to pass goods without dastak, under the care of other boats having a dastak, it shall be seized.

8th. The gumashtahs shall not use force in buying or selling, and shall bring all their complaints to the Faujdars instead of taking the law into their own hands.

9th. The Faujdars shall transmit to the Nawab copies of their proceedings, and the Governor shall be free to apply to the Nawab for redress in case any Faujdar is found guilty of partiality, or oppression.

Mr. Vansittart's attempt to regulate the inland trade according to the above plan was certainly well-meaning, and logical, but his policy is open to grave objections. Firstly, he showed great imprudence in divulging his plan to the Nawab before discussing it in the Council. It is strange that he did not anticipate the natural opposition of his colleagues aganinst his proposals. Secondly, he was mistaken 61 in believing

60 Narrative, II, pp. 155—159; Trans. P. L. I. 1762—3, No. 4. p. 9
Beng. Pub. Cons. Dec. 27, 1762
" " " Jan. 20, 1763

61 Beng. Pul. Cons. Nov. 15, 1762. The Council in their letter to the Governor may be said to have only vaguely requested him to settle "these matters upon a solid plan".

that he had been fully authorised to make even fundamental changes on behalf of the Council. Thirdly, he should not have assured the Nawab that the proposed regulations would certainly be established. The promise[62] made by him to the Nawab was both hasty and tactless. Fourthly, he unwisely acquiesced in the Nawab's desire to control the gumashtahs and other subordinates of the country though his Faujdars. He should have realised that it was too dangerous a concession to be tolerated by his colleagues. Fifthly, he was unjustified in yielding to the Nawab's objections in regard to the coinage of the Company's 'siccas' at the different mints, the manufacture of salt, the holding of markets, the purchase of lands, the trade in Assam, and such other vital matters without insisting on a thorough investigation, and consultation with the gentlemen concerned.[63] Sixthly, he did not satisfactorily settle how the Company's trade could be distinguished from that of its servants. Undue interference of the Nawab's officers in the Company's trade was henceforth not unlikely.[64] Finally, he committed a serious blunder in accepting[65] a monetory gift from the Nawab. He thus courted the criticism that he had willingly sacrificed the rights of the Englishmen on receipt of a substantial bribe. As a matter of fact, the money that the Governor now received was the present promised by the Nawab before the revolution.

The Governor's visit to Monghyr is of interest from another point of view. He could observe at first hand the remarkable change in the whole spirit of the Nawab's government. Mir Qasim was a changed[66] man, and he was no longer submissive and conciliatory. His attitude wae perceptibly dictatorial, and the Governor failed to perceive that the Nawab had been aiming at complete independence.[67] Mr. Vansittart was given an opportunity to witness a grand parade of the Nawab's troops, which the latter had purposely arranged to make an ostentatious exhibition of his military strength.[68] The new army organised under the command of Gurgin Khan extorted the admiration of the Governor.[69]

62 Nasrative, II, p. 163; Siyar, p. 716; Terikh-i-muzaffari, p. 780 (MS)

63 Beng. Pub. Cons. Jan. 17, 1763, vide letter from the Chief and Council of Dacca, dated Jan. 10, 1763.

64 Interference was immediately reported from different places, and the Governor had to complain of it in his letter to the Nawab.

Trans. P. L. I. 1762—3, Nos. 7—9, pp. 10—13.

65 Select Committee Report, 1772; I (2) App. 80; Third Report, 1773, p. 311. He had received Rs 500,000 for himself, and Rs 200,000 for Caillaud. (First Report, Vol. III, p. 168. Caillaud's evidence)

66 Muzaffar-namah (MS) p. 336

67 Ibid and Bolts, "Considerations on Indian Affairs" p. 42.

68 Siyar, p. 716 69 Khulasat (J. B. O. R. S. V. p. 607)

The whole force of the Nawab at present consisted of about sixteen thousand horse, and a few battalions of Sepoys.[70] Ghulam Husain has left a vivid description of the parade, and the Governor's views regarding the troops. According to him,[71] the Governor expressed his opinion about the army in the following terms:—"I have seen your troops, and acknowledge that you have accoutred and disciplined them very well· but these are only good against Indians, and people of this climate. Beware of ever opposing them to Europeans, or of coming to a rupture with the English, upon a confidence reposed in your people; for, rest assured that you shall find yourself disappointed, and that these men will never stand the brunt of European soldiers. Beware, therefore, of trusting your honour to such hands." Kalyan Singh too has given a similar account.[72] Did Mr. Vansittart suspect that these troops might be used against the English?[73]

Before returning to Calcutta, the Governor went to Patna where he arrived on 1st January, 1763. Here he had to decide among other things two out-standing questions regarding the Burbunna gate, and the Colonelganji. The Burbunna gate in the north-west quarter of the city had been closed under the orders of the Nawab, and Ellis had long complained of it; while the Colonelgunj was a market near the English factory set up apparently without any sanction either from the Nawab, or from the company, and it had so far been a continual source of dispute with the Nawab's government. The Governor complied with the wishes of the Nawab, agreed that the gate should remain shut up, and gave instructions for the abolition of the market. On January 4, he wrote to the Naib at Patna, "Agreeably to your desire, I have directed Mr. Ellis to abolish Colonelgunge, and accordingly orders have, from this day, been given to the merchants not to bring their goods there any more; ...... as to the shutting the wicket, though there does not appear to be any great necessity for it, and the going round about will be an inconvenience to the people of the factory, nevertheless, at it is the Nabob's order, do it whenever you please, nobody will obstruct you."[74] Although, these were only minor points, yet they serve to illustrative the Governor's characteristic aquiescence in whatever the Nawab insisted upon. In yielding to the Nawab's wishes, the Governor took hardly any

70 Narrative, II, p. 185

71 Siyar, (English Translation, Calcutta Reprint, II, p. 44) Vide also Tarikh-i-muzaffari MS, p. 779

72 Khulasat (J. B. O. R. S. V. p. 607)

73 Although the Siyar seems to suggest thus, Mr. Vansittart does not say anything about it in his Narrative.

74 Trans. P. L. I. 1762—3, No. 2, p. 4

serious notice at all of the objections of Ellis. In fact, there were a number of cogent arguments[75] against the shutting of the gate:—

(i) The servants of the factory were put to needless inconvenience, and were deprived of an easy access to the city;

(ii) The Nawab's plea that the gate must be closed in the interest of good order in the city was hollow, and there was no reason why it should be shut up even in the day time;

(iii) The gate had been kept open for more than twenty years past, and there was no immediate necessity for closing it now; besides, it was of no advantage to the Nawab himself;

(iv) The Gate had been used by the people of the factory for a long time past, and it was by this way that they could easily come to the city for its assistance at the time of the Shahazadha's attack;

(v) The closing of the gate created a false alarm, and it was rumoured that there no longer existed any friendship between the Nawab and the Company.

(vi) Unless the Nawab meant to strengthen the town against the factory itself, there was no point in his safeguarding that part of the town which was closest to the factory;

(vii) The closing of the gate could be of no use for the security of the town against a foreign enemy;

(viii) The Nawab's action in closing the gate, and ordering the intrenchment by the river was due more to pique against Ellis than to any other reason, and finally,

(ix) The prestige of the Company had suffered owing to the shutting up of the gate, as the Nawab's action seemed to be clearly indicative of his distrust of the English.

The market too being close to the factory had been very useful to ite people, and its abolition would cause real difficulty in the regular and cheap supply of provisions.[76] The Governor, therefore, requested the Naib to allow Ellis to build some 'golas' for storing 20,000 maunds of grain for the use of the factory.[77] The Naib was, however, subsequently reported to have stopped all boats going to, and coming from Colonelganj under the instructions of the Nawab, and the Governor had to protest against this.[78] Ellis further complained, "The encouragement given to Nodit Roy on this occasion has induced him to seize, and carry away by force all the dealers of this gunge, to detain boats loaded with

75 Beng. Pub. Cons. 17th Feb. 1763; Trans. P. L. I. 1762—3, No. 24, p. 25
76 Beng. Pub. Cons. 18th Feb. 1763
77 Trans. P. L. I. 1762—3 No. 2
78 Ibid, No. 14

our own particular property having dustucks. and to send the Chief word that he will not suffer a further importation of grain. He has likewise publicly punished those boatmen who have been long employcd in this service, and made proclamations through the city that whoever brings grain to the English shall be treated in the same manner........"[79] As this was a grave charge, a strong letter was written to the Nawab on the subject.[80] The latter in his reply ridiculed the charge, and rejected it as a malicious lie concocted by Ellis.[81] On the whole, it was tactless on the part of the Governor when he readily complied with the desire of the Nawab in the matter of the gate, and the market. The hostile majority in the Council forced him,[82] subsequently to write to the Nawab askidg him to order the opening of the gate. although the decision in regard to the market was unanimously approved.[83] The Nawab was ultimately obliged to direct the gate and the intrenchment at Patna to be opened.[84]

The Governor left Patna on January 5, and stopped at Monghyr for a day to see the Nawab, and left Monghyr on the 9th for Calcutta.[85] His mission to Monghyr had been actuated by good intentions, but he failed to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of the points at issue. By imprudently proposing the ill-fated regulations, and thus arousing the wrath of his collegues whom he had not previously consulted,[86] he only hastened the inevitable rupture with the Nawab.

79 Beng. Pub. Cons. 18th Feb. 1763

80 Trans. P.L.R. 1762-3, No. 25.

81 Trans. P.L.R. January September 1763 No. 13, p. 12,

82 Beng, Pub. Cens. Feb. 19, 1763.

83 " " " "

84 Trans. P.L.R. January—September 1763 No. 19, p 19.

85 Narrative, p. 184, and p. 187.

86 Vide Letter from Carnac to Clive, dated 26th Feb. 1763 (Malcolm's Life of Clive, II, p. 283) Carnac wrote, "These concessions are so evidently shameful and disadvantageous to us, that it is not to be conceived they could ever have been submitted to, except by persons who were brought into them......"

TEKKALI ROCK INSCRIPTIONS OF PADMACHANDRADEB.

SRI LAKSHMINARAYAN HARICHANDAN JAGADEB.

Near Nandigam, a village in Tekkali Taluk, flows a rivulet called 'Sandama Gadda', which never gets dry. This name of the rivulet does not go without a significance. In the 11th century A.D. Padmachandra the ruler of Bijayapur had installed an idol of the goddess 'Chandi' on the bank of this small river, which came to be known by the name "Chandinalo". The Telugus call a rivulet as "gadda" and as time passed by, this rivulet came to be known as 'Chandigadda'. Having drifted through the channel of slang terminology, this word 'chandi' lost its 'ch' sound, and in its place it acquired the 'sa' sound. Thus, the name 'Chandinalo' was replaced by 'Sandama Gadda'. This rivulet now flows at a distance of about six miles from Tekkali towards the east.

Not far from it is a small hillock near Nandigam close to which is a pond, "Sitaghai" by name. In this hillock is a beautiful den in which there is a rock inscription denoting the installation of the idol of Chandi. Being inscribed inside the den, the inscription remains unaffected by sun and rain. It runs, through three lines of Sanskrit, as follows:—

१. रामचण्डो २. प्रतिष्ठा ३. पद्मचन्दस्य[1]

The meaning of which is "Padmachandra had installed Ramachandi",

This inscription by no means enable us to get at a full knowledge of Padmachandra except that he might have been a Raja or Rajkumar because such deeds are generally done by Rajahs.

Another stone inscription from that hill has now been unfolded with great effort. This inscription has been inscribed in five lines of Sanskrit, just above the gate way of the aforesaid beautiful den. Owing to the demage caused by sun and rain, it is not easy to notice the existence of it. The reading of the inscription is reproduced below:—

१ ॐ श्रीदेवेन्द्रवर्म । २ स्य राज्ये सैञा च[2] तीर्थे

३ विजयप पद्मचन्द्रस्य प्रतिष्ठा । ४ [3]जैष्ठमासि कृष्णपञ्चमीसम्वत्सरे २३

५ (शकाद्ब) १०१२

Translation:—

"On the fifth day of the new moon of the month of '*Jyēṣṭa*' of Śaka 1012, Padmachendra Deb, the Ruler of Bijayapur has installed, in the 23rd year of his rule, at 'Sanyasatirtha' which is in the kingdom of Sri Devendravarma".

From this it is inferred that in Śaka 1012 or 1090 A. D., Padmachendra Dev, the ruler of Bijayapur and the accomplisher of this stone inscription, was the *Sāmānta* Raja of Maharaja Devendravarma. It remains to be determined now as to, who this Devendravarma was.

1 read पद्मचन्द्र. 2 read सन्यास. 3 read जेष्ठ

The name of Devendravarma is noticed in one of the inscriptions available in the "Gokarneswar mandir" at the top of the Mahendra hill.

"जयति निजभुजाली निर्जितोर्वीपमौलि प्रणति गलितमाल्यालङ्कृति स्थानभूमिः। विमल यति यदीयं धाम लोकं समस्तं कलिमलिनितमुच्चैर्भ्राजि राजेन्द्रचोडः ॥
विध्वस्तं निजविक्रमेण विमलादित्यं कुलूतेश्वरम्
संग्रह्याद्रिनिभान् कलिङ्गपतिना दत्तान् वरान् वारणान्।
भित्वा दण्डपतिर्जगद्विजयिनी राजेन्द्रचोलस्यसम्
स्थाप्राप्ते शिखरे व्यधत्तविजयस्तम्भं महेन्द्राचले"॥

"Rajendrachoda, the Sovereign, who always shines with the garlands slipped from the heads of monarchs at the time of their bowing before him as a consequence of their defeat, and whose splendour sheds light on all the filthy people of 'Kaliyuga' has been victorious. It is this Rajendrachoda's subject chief, the universally triumphant great hero that destroyed 'Kuluteswar Vimaladitya' in battle, and being presented with many elephants by the ruler of Kalinga, he set up the pillar of triumph on the top of the Mahendra Hill."

The Kalingādhipati or Ruler of Kalinga referred to in the abovementioned inscription is no other than Devendravarma. The reason for this is clear from the big Rock Inscription of the Chola king Rajendrachoda, which is available at Draksharam in the Godavari District viz :—

"भस्मीकृत्य कलिङ्गदेशमखिलं निर्जित्य गांगां रणे।
भङ्क्त्वा कोशलणण्डपाल निवहै र्देवन्द्रवर्मादिकान्
वीरः पल्लवराय इत्यभिहितो राजेन्द्रचोडप्रभोः
कीर्त्युत्तम्भमिवी सन्धिषुइ जयस्तम्भं शुभं न्याक्षिपत्॥"

The meaning of it can be rendered thus:—

"Pallava Raya, the great hero and Commander-in-chief of Rajendra choda with the allied powers of all 'Khandapālas or Vassal Rajahs of Kosala-khanda defeated Devendravarma, the Ruler of Kalinga, bringing down the Kalinga kingdom to ashes and set up the monument of glory at the border line of "Udra Desa" ie, on the top of the Mahendra Hill.

It is discerned from the above inscription that it was inscribed in Śaka 1024 or 1102 A. D. Devendravarma who was reigning in Kalinga in 1102 A,D. was not at all a different personage from the Devendravarma of our present rock inscription of 1090 A. D.

Besides this, three Copper-plate Inscriptions of this Devendravarma have been secured. The territory of Bijayapur of Padmachandra was under the sway of the aforesaid Devendravarma. His Samanta Raja's (Padmachandra's) territory Bijayapur which might be the present village of Bejjipalli is near the above mentioned Nandigam village.

It seems that before Padmachandra's time, a sanyasi or asectic used to reside in this cave where the present rock inscription exists. Hence its name was once Sanyāsāsramam. And the tank that lies adjacent to this cave might have been called Sanyasi Thirtha. It seems probable that through slang usage of the term, 'Sanyachtirtha' took the place of 'Sanyasitirtha'.

THE REVENUE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NORTHERN SARCARS.
(1769—1786)

DR. LANKA SUNDARAM, M.A. Ph.D. (Lond)., F.R. Econ.S; F.R. Stat. S.

(Continued from page 190, Vol. VI Part 2).

Chapter II.

Anarchy and Dual Government (1759 1768.)

"For seven years the completest anarchy ever recorded in the history of Hindoostan prevailed over all the five northern Circars. The forms, nay, even the remembrances of civil government, seemed to be wholly lost. Lords became vassels, renters were called proprietors, and amildars changed condition with their inferior officers, by accepting Zemindary russooms, or yearly acknowledgments to lessen the recorded value and standing revenue of the lands."

James Grant : *Political Survey of the Northern Circars.* (1784)

The preceeding chapter has described the long series of incoherent arrangements made by the Madras Government before they assumed direct and complete responsibility for the administration of the Sarkars in 1768. This chapter will deal with the same period (1759-1768) from the purely revenue point of view. It is obvious that during a period of anarchy and want of consistently recognizable authority, the Sarkars could not have the benefits of a systematic policy of revenue administration. All that was done was the collection of the revenues of the Sarkars by means of experimental agreements with short-lived *amildars* and renters as under the Muhammadan regime. During this period of gross revenue speculation, the *amildars* and renters appointed by the Court of Hyderabad were recognised and supported by the Madras government. To bring these arrangements into clear relief, it is necessary to review the revenue administration of the French Company during the years 1750-1759.

1. *Revenue Administration of the French.* (1750—1759).

The French East India Company acquired the Masulipatam farms in 1750, and the Sarkars in general by the Treaty of Aurangabad in 1753. During the first few years of the French rule, the Sarkars did

not come under their complete control. Bussy was prevented from minutely investigating the revenue resources of the Sarkars, since his presence was frequently called for at Hyderabad and beyond to settle the affairs of the *Subadar* of the Dekhan. As Orme points out, it was not till 1754 that Bussy could direct his attention to a systematic subjugation of the Sarkars and even then his attempts were not attended with complete success. After his arrival at Masulipatam in July 1754, he remained in the Sarkars till the end of that year "continually employed in settling the government and often either marching in person or sending detachments to collect the revenues from the poligars or chiefs of the woodland countries, who, trusting to their wilds and fastnesses never pay but at the point of the sword".[1] The former deputies of the Hyderabad government were continued in their stations as the agents of the French Company. No drastic changes were made either in the internal administration or in the hereditary *personnel* employed for the collection of of the revenues. The zamindars "were generally permitted to enjoy, under French sannads, their russooms and saverums or conditional hereditary privileges, amounting to from eight to twelve per cent of the revenues collected".[2] The Chicacole Sarkar was the only exception to this rule. Partly due to the want of easy reach from Masulipatam, the seat of administration, and partly owing to the extreme turbulance of numerous petty zamindars who divided this Sarkar into small principalities, each with his *sibbandi* corps, which made them semi-dependent of any authority, Chicacole easily lent itself to indirect management. Vijayarama Razu the Great was granted a major part of this Sarkar at a very low rent. Under this arrangement, the Razu paid fourteen lakhs of rupees, other rajas paid nine Lakhs and Bussy himself managed lands yielding three lakhs, thus making a total of twenty-four lakhs of annual revenue for the whole of this Sarkar.[3]

The truce of 1754 between the French and the English Companies did not have any effect upon the revenue policy of Bussy. He was too ambitious to reconcile himself to a position of at least nominal equality with the English Company in the Sarkars. But his attempts to restore order in the country and to realise the full benefits of its possession were curbed by persistent plots at the Court of Hyderabad. It was not till 1757 when Vijayarama Razu the Great requested his help for the reduction of Bobbili, that he could attempt a comprehensive survey of the revenue resources of the Sarkars.

1 *History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan*, Vol I, pp. 403—404.

2 James Grant; *Political Survey of the Northern Circars*, as Appendix No. 13 to the *Fifth Report*, Firminger, Vol. III, p. 14

3 *Masulipatam to Madras*, 12 October 1792. *Milit. Cons.* 25 October, Vol. 48, p. 338—b.

A review of the revenue administration of the French in the Sarkars is severely handicapped by the paucity of revenue statistics. Apart from the broad outlines of Bussy's famous *kastobud* of 1757-58 supplied by Grant, we have no other authentic and comprehensive data dealing with the Sarkars for the whole period of French administration. But, Dupleix supplies us with some details throwing a general light on the revenue resources of Masulipatam and enabling us to understand the same under the English Company.

Bussy's Administration

According to Bussy, the French Company did not receive any benefit from the grant of the Masulipatam farms during the first year of their occupation.[4] The former *faujdars* left very little to be collected from the zamindars and renters and, in general, large balances of revenue, most of them being practically bad debts, were handed-over to him. Bussy had no occasion to draw upon the revenues of the Sarkars until 1754, when the Sarkar of Kondavidu supplied a revenue of Rs. 6,00,000 which he applied to meeting charges of the military forces in his service.[5] The Mutapalli division capable of an annual revenue of Rs- 1,20,000 and the copper mines and salt revenues of Kondavidu estimated at a like amount, were never enjoyed by the French.[6] The Devarakota *pargana* was the most unfortunate district before and after its acquisition by the French. Immigrants from Kondavidu who peopled this formerly rich division fled from the country immediately after the French took charge of its revenue management, and hence occasioned a serious loss to the treasury.[7]

The position of the Masulipatam revenues under the French may be stated as follows:8

Year.	*Rupees.*
1751—52	1,22,727
1752—53	3,79,251
1753—54	9,94,196
1754—55	11,77,744

4 *Memoire pour le sieur de Bussy*, p. 30.
I am indebted to Mr. H. A. Woodham of the India Office Library for kindly reading with me and translating certain passages in the memoirs of Dupleix and Bussy.

5 *Ibid* p. 53 6 *Memoire pour le sieur Dupleix*. Appendix 49. 7 *Ibid* p 52.

8 *Ibid* pp. 35—37; 45—49; and 51—52. See also Appendix "A" to this thesis
Figures for 1751—54 are taken from a statement supplied by M de la Selle, Chief of Masulipatam, and countersigned by M. Moracin, (15th July 1754).
The figure for 1751 is arrived at by the addition of the estimated receipts for the second half of the year.
Those for 1755—58 are supplied by a statement signed by Moracin, but undated.

1755—56	13,52,440
1756—57	13,95,260
1757—58	14,41,208

It will be obvious from this statement that the Masulipatam revenues were drawn from a larger area at the end than at the outset of French administration. The Devarakota *pargana* was first included in the figure for 1752-53, while Kondavidu was mentioned in that for 1753-54. But a progressive increase of the revenues is perceptible in the statement. For example, the Kondavidu revenues which totalled Rs. 4,88,000 in 1753-54 practically doubled (Rs. 8,81,908) by 1757-58. This increase is partly accounted for by the fact that with the establishment of security in the country and with the acquisition of a knowledge of the capacity of the farms, the rents were naturally augmented. But it will have to be admitted that the rate of increase is extraordinary and naturally reacted on the prosperity of the renters as well as on that of the agriculturists.[9]

Bussy's fame as an administrator rests on the comprehensive revenue survey of the Sarkars which was carried out under his instructions. Our sole authority on this subject is James Grant. With his characteristic eloquence, which compels us to be cautious to accept his statements, he describes this survey in the following terms:—"At length a complete survey and *hustabud*, a detailed account of the gross collections of the whole country, infinitely more accurate and useful than the famous Doomsday Book of England was formed, and put Mr. Bussy in the knowledge of resources entirely beyond the reach of his Mussulman predecessors and greatly exceeding, perhaps, the general belief of modern financiers. ... But moderation was necessary for a recent foreign administration. The Jummabundy or annual assessment therefore, was only doubled in Chicacole[10] and Rajahmundry and brought somewhere nearer the *kham wassool* or gross receipts in other provinces. Besides which as a temporary expedient, the Zemindars were bound to maintain the public peace, defray all charges of collection, and keep on foot a sebundy corps or militia of twelve thousand infantry[11]... All this, however, we believe to have been only the first step towards establishing a more

9 Richard Fairfield, the Chief of Masulipatam, wrote that one of the reasons which might have induced the zamindars to acquiesce in the Company's protecting hand during the *nawab*ship of Hussain Ali was due to "the low state the French reduced them to", See *Masulipatam to Madras*, 12 October 1762. *Milit, Cons.* 25 October. Vol. 48 p. 336.

10 The Madras records state that he increased the Chicacole *jamabandi* by only fifty per cent. See *Milit. Cons.* 23 June 1766, Vol, 57 pp. 194-200.

11 This measure was clearly temporary. As a rule, "the French had a large force in this country and yet were often obliged to chastise the Jamidars". See *Masulipatam to Madras* 12 October. 1762. *Idem*, 25th October, Vol. 48 p. 336.

adequate Jumma Kamil or standard revenue, which a future prospect of stability was to make progressive. This we believe to have been the equitable political result of Mr. Bussy's scheme of finance, if he had been allowed to complete it, though the ignorant culminators of that great man, without attending to the other inexhaustive (inexhaustible) sources of private wealth, which he possessed in commending the entire ministerial influence of the Nizamut, do not give his disinterestedness all the credit due in the adjustments in the meantime concluded for the annual revenues of the Circars''.[12] This tribute from the former British resident at Hyderabad could not have been undeserved, but it is regret-table that the details of such an exhaustive survey have been lost.

It is difficult exactly to estimate the actual revenue derived from the Sarkars under the French regime. There are at least five distinct estimates of the gross revenues for the period under review which demand examination. The following statement illustrates the position of the estimates.[13]

Estimates of Gross Revenues (In Rupees).

Salabat Jang[14]	32,00,000
Bussy[15]	20,39,832
Madras Records[16]	52,37,200
James Grant[17]	59,29,243
Hollingsbery[18]	31,00,000

The inconsistency in these figures is easily explained. Salabat Jang's estimate naturally referred to the period preceeding Bussy's *hastobud* which admittedly enhanced the rate of revenue assessment. Bussy's own estimate left out the Guntur Sarkar. The estimate gleaned from the Madras records is not exhaustive enough and left out the Guntur Sarkar, since the Madras Government had neither the opportunity nor the nece-ssity to enquire into its revenue resources till it was acquired in 1788, by which time the capacity of the *sarkar* had altered beyond recognition especially in view of the fact that at that time the zamindars had been partially demilitarised and paid an enhanced *jamabandi*, Hollingsbery's account is not authentic enough since it copied the traditional sum at which the Sarkars were rated in the Muhammaden accounts. On the

12 *Political Survey*. Firminger. Vol. III p. 14

13 These estimates are given in the chronological order.

14 *Salabat Jang to the King of France*, as an enclosure to *Nawab of Arcot to Madras*, received 5 July 1756, see *Country Correspondence* No. 174 for 1756. p. 89.

15 *Memoire pour le sieur de Bussy*, pp. 43—44

16 *Milit. Cons*. 13 August 1764. Vol. 51 pp. 598—605.

17 *Political Survey*. Firminger, Vol. III, pp. 51—53

18 *Nizam Alee Khaun* p. Lvii.

whole, Grant's estimate may be accepted with confidence, as it specifically relates to the revenues of the Sarkars after Bussy's revenue survey.

It should be clearly noted here that these figures represent only gross collections and include several incidental charges which we are not in a position to estimate. Notwithstanding Grant's assertions to the contrary, after the deductions of military expenses, the net revenues must have been considerably lesser than the figures given above.[19] This will be clearly explained by a comparison of the revenues collected by Bussy prior to 1759 and by Hussain Ali during the year 1759--60.[20]

Revenues in Rupees under

Sarkar	*Bussy.*	*Hussain Ali.*
Chicacole	11,50,000	5,00,000[21]
Rajahmundry	16,75,200	11,44,000
Ellore	8,52,000	6,27,404
Mustafanagar	6,16,000	4,46,800
Murtizanagar	2,44,000	8,60,000[22]
Total	45,37,200	35,78,204

Explaining the relation of these totals to each other, the Madras Council observed: "The striking difference between Nizam Ally's Deputy and Mr. Bussy (i.e. between their revenue receipts) was occasioned by the former's having no command over the powerful Jemmindars, while the latter left (sic) the countries at the head of a well-appointed army which awed them all so much that the Jemmindars of Peddapore and Pittapore paid him Madras Pagadas 3,15,000 and to Hussain Ally only Madras Pagadas 2,06,000".[23] But even when allowance has been made for the presence of military expenses, the French revenue assessment of the Sarkars seems to have been excessive.

19 Milit Cons. 13 August 1764. Vol. 51 pp. 598—605

20 I give the figures in Rupees for the sake of clearness.

21 At this period Hussain Ali never collected any revenue from the Chicacole Sarkar. I Supply the figure from the Madras Government's first settlement Vijayarama Razu.

22 The estimate for the Murtizanagar Sarkar under Hussain Ali is based upon his collections from that Sarkar which he enjoyed prior to its grant to Basalat Jang.

23 *Milit. Cons.* 13 August 1764 Vol. 51, pp. 598—605.

There is a slight difference between the total of Bussy's revenues supplied by the Madras records here and the figure used in the preceeding comparative statement.

11. *Revenue Administration of the Masulipatam Farms (1759—68).*

The Masulipatam Farms a separate Sarkar.

"The districts of Masulipatam from the coast of the grand division of the Circars, and .. are only portions of the maritime border dismembered for certain use from the four Southern provinces".24 They constitute an area of 700 square miles and a long strip of territory about five miles in breadth extending from Motupalli in the Guntur District to Pentakota in the Vizagapatam District.25

The revenue administration of the Masulipatam farms forms a distinct subject till the acquisition of the Sarkars by the East India Company by the treaties of 1766 and 1768. There are several reasons for a separate treatment of these farms. Since its capture by the French in 1750, the fort and town of Masulipatam and the farms immediately dependent thereon were grouped together and administered on an independent basis without any reference to the administration of the five major divisions generally known as the Northern Sarkars. A computation of the "Masulipatam revenues" was kept both by the French and the English Companies. Dupleix gives a clear and detailed analysis of their revenues for the period 1751—59.26 These farms were specifically mentioned in the "requests" made by Col. Forde in 1759;27 and were the only territories which from the first remained in the possession of the English Company as the fruits of conquest.28 These were administered direct by the Chief of Masulipatam all through the period of anarchy that prevailed in the Sarkars between 1759 and 1768. "From these circumstances it is pretty evident that Masulipatam was considered as a district in itself, or, perhaps, as forming a sixth circar".29 Till 1768, the revenue business of these farms was transacted in the civil department of the Madras government, while that of the Sarkars was dealt with in the Military department. Finally, the experience gained in the management of these farms was greatly responsible for the evolution of the later revenue policy of the Madras government when all the Sarkars were administered on an uniform basis. Hence, it is necessary that an acccount of the management of these farms should be given separately.

The Northern Sarkars had always been regarded by the Directors of the East India Company as a profitable field for investment in cotton

24 Grant's *Political Survey*. Firminger. Vol. III p. 5.
25 *Ibid.* In the Sarvasiddhi Taluk.
26 *Memoire pour le sieur Dupleix.* Appendix pp. 35—37; 45—49 and 51—52.
27 *Aitchison* Vol. ix. p. 20
28 Russell: *A Short History of the East India Company*, p. 64
29 *Ibid.*

The Sarkars primarily prized for investment.

and printed goods. Ever since 1611 they obtained commercial privileges from the court of Hyderabad and from several individual local proprietors, and thus gradually built up an extensive trade in longcloth, calicoes, chintz and other goods for which the Sarkars are famous even to the present day. In 1755, when the Sarkars were under the complete control of the French, the Court of Directors wrote to Madras. "The Northern settlements must likewise be the constant object of your attention; they must be timely and well supplied with money, especially with copper coins, the want of which, we find, considerably impeded their investments".[30] Again in 1758, when the Company's fortunes in the Sarkars were at their lowest, they wrote. "The loss of the northern settlement is of so great importance to the Company that we shall depend upon you having done and continuing to do everything in your power for their recovery".[31] But territorial acquisition was never their objective. A couple of months later they directed that "whenever those settlements were recovered or restored,[32] you are to consider what will be the best method of providing the investments whether by contract with men, or by the Bengal method of Gomastahs[33] or any other which shall appear most advantageous to the Company".[34] They constantly discounted the actual monetary advantages of a territorial interest in the Sarkars which was sure to be attended with considerable military charges and other political complications. Even as late as 1767, by which time the Madras Government had been directly or indirectly concerned in the revenue business of the Sarkars for a period of eight years and the Company acquired at least a nominal right to the possession of the countries by the grant of Shah Alam in 1765 and by the incomplete treaty of Hyderadad in 1766, the Court of Directors wrote. "Another powerful motive for engaging the Rajah of Chicacole[35] in our interest, is the advantage that may thereby accrue in the extension of our investment, *an object which ought never to gi e place to any other*,[36] for it is by that means only we see any probability of realising at home any part of our territorial revenues".[37]

30 *Madras Dispatches* 13 January 1755. para 26 Vol. I. p. 362. Bourchier's government took strong measures in this respect in 1768. See *Pub. Cons.* 18 July 1758, Vol. 27 p. 542.

31 *Madras Dispatches* 12 May 1758, para 13 Vol. I. p 921-b.

32 In 1757 the East India Company lost all its settlements in the Sarkars,

33 Accountant-Managers.

34 *Madras Dispatches* 5 July 1758, para 12 Vol. I. p. 932.

35 Sitharamarazu as the *defacto* Raja of Vijayanagaram.

36 The underlining is mine.

37 *Madras Dispatches* 4 March 1767, para 9 Vol. III pp. 576-77.

From these repeated declarations of the Court of Directors it is evident that their chief financial interest in the Sarkars was purely commercial. The advantages of such an interest were two-fold. In the first place, capital investment in the handicrafts of the Sarkars yielded an appreciable direct profit. Secondly, it was free from any concomitant charges, like the heavy military expenses which always attended the revenue administration of territorial units during this period. The Masulipatam farms easily lent themselves to the policy advocated by the Court of Directors. A long thin strip of coast land, spanning the estuaries of at least two important rivers, the Kistna and the Godavari, besides other minor waterways, and studded with numerous ports and weaving and cloth printing centres, the "Masulipatam farms" were easily administrated on a purely commercial basis. And, hence, their revenue consisted chiefly, if not totally, of land and sea customs, and salt and abkari revenues. In this connection it will be remembered that after the deduction of the expenses of revenue collection, any sums derived from the lease of purely agricultural farms which filled up the interstices between the numerous commercial and handicraft centres, supplied the wherewithal for the Company's investment.38

Revenue administration-a commercial proposition.

After the capture of Masulipatam in 1759, Colonel Forde took immediate steps to lease the farms dependent on that settlement.39 Not being acquainted with the revenue business of these farms, he naturally dealt with them in a summary fashion and found best to continue the previous renters in their possessions for a period of three years.4 Revenue figures for 1752–62 are not available; but a meagre note to the effect that the sea customs alone

Forde's settlement.

38 *Pub. Cons.* 26 December 1759. vol. 17 (pages not numbered in this place. This order was temporarily suspended on 10 July 1760. *Idem* Vol. 18 p. 852.

39 *Milit. Cons.* 12 November 1759. Vol. 42, p. 683. Andrews here informs Madras that he had sent for the Zamindars with a view to settle the revenue business relating to the Masulipatam farms.

40 *Pub. Cons.* 20 December 1759. Vol. 17.

The Public Consultations for the years 1757—1774 only contain abstracts of letters received from and sent to the various subordinate settlements. In 1774 Revenue Consultations were first instituted in which correspondence relating to revenue business was fully copied.

On the other hand, the Military Consultations for the present period are thorough and run in the actual form of correspondence.

In the Public Consultations the letters are serially numbered for each year and referred to as being entered in the "Letter Book". These 'Letter Books' are not available at the India Office.

provided a revenue of about Rs. 1,35,000 is all that can be gleaned from the Public Consultations for 1759.[41]

But this paucity of information is made up in another way which clearly indicates the genuine desire of the Madras government to foster the welfare of the renters and cultivators. Discussing the desirability of demanding security from renters, they resolved that they "are unanimously of opinion that the insisting on security is in the end a loss to the company as well as ruinous to the farmers, for, as the shroffs[42] and others of substance and credit to be accepted as security will not engage themselves without large considerations and deposits in their hands; the others[43] because as there are but few such in the settlement, the renters cannot give so much for the farms by all the money they pay for security which it is supposed does not amount to less, all charges included, than ten per cent, besides the great difficulties they are put to for a present sum in deposit in the security's hands".[44] To obviate this hardship, the Madras government adopted the tentative policy of accepting the rents from the farmers in monthly instalments. But this arrangement was in no way an unmixed blessing. When once the necessity of supplying security for the regular payment of rent was removed, the renters not only offered ridiculous sums in order to secure the lease of the farms and realised all they could during the first few months of their tenure but also left the debit columns of the Company's accounts swelling month by month. Thus, in 1761, the Chief of Masulipatam submitted an account detailing "a desperate debt" of over five thousand rupees from a single renter Nibhanpudi Telaganna who enjoyed the lease of the Gudur farm.[45]

Early Revenue Policy.

After the expiry of Col. Forde's triennial lease in 1762, the Masulipatam farms were advertised and sealed proposals for their rent invited both at Masulipatam and at Madras.[46] Of the seven sets of proposals received,[47] the following were accepted for one year:[48]

Annual leases

41 On this settlement, the Court of Directors wrote in 1762, that they find that the Masulipatam revenues amounted to four lakhs of rupees a year and hoped that by "proper management they will produce considerably more, as we have been assured that that sum is infinitely far short of what the French made of that country". *Madras Dispatches* 27 January 1762 para 32 Vol. II pp. 396.97.

42 Broker-bankers.

43 *Pub. Cons.* 23 August 1759. Vol. 17 pp. 309—10

44 *Pub. Cons.* 23 August 1759. Vol. 17, pp. 309—10

45 *Idem.* 16 November 1761. Vol. 19. pp. 484—85.

46 *Idem.* 9 March 1762 Vol. 20 p. 154.

47 *Idem.* 23 April, *idem*, pp. 222-23.

48 *Idem.* 10 May *idem*, pp. 259-62; and 29 December, p. 572 which enumerates the rents of the last three farms.

FARM.	RENTER.	RENT IN M. Ps.
Nilapalli[49]	Kandregula Jaggappa.	2,100
Bendamurlanka[50] and towns.	Mosalikanti Venkata-ramayya.	3,050
Ghurjanapalli.[51]	Madarazu Bhoganna	300
Sakhinetipalli and Rameswaram[52]	Bhupatirazu Jagannadha Razu.	1,550
Inuguduru.[53]	Madarazu Ramayya.	2,300
Tonduru and Bondada[54]	Arichunda Razu, Raja of Mugalaturru.	16,500
Tummidi and Pedana.[55]	,,	8,500
Narsapur Salt.[56]	,,	3,500
Nizampatam.[57]	Mir Bakhar.	23,000
Divi[58]	Madala Reddi Naik and Bhogapati Gurrazu.	
Antervedi[59]	Madala Reddi Naik and Bhogapati Gurrazu.	650
Gudur and Akula-mannadu.[60]	,,	10,600
Six islands of Divi.	Mosalikanti Kamaji, Jagga Pantulu and Amaravasi Tirupati.	2,280

Nearly a decade earlier, the Court of Directors specifically directed the Madras government to prefer annual leases to long-term rents with respect to the *jagir* round Madras See *Madras Dispatches* 24 January 1754 Vol. I p. 98.

The Court approved this lease in para 57 of their dispatch of 9 March 1763. See, *idem*, Vol. II. p. 635.

49 Adjacent to Yanam on the mouths of the Goutami Godavari.

50 On the northern branch of the Vasistha Godavari in the Amalapuram taluk of the East Godavari district.

51 In the W. Godavari District.

52 N. E. of the Vasistha Godavari and on the Nagaram island in the Razol taluk of the East Godavari district.

53 A *peta* or suburb of Masulipatam.

54 In the Bhimavaram taluk of the West Godavari district.

55 In the Gudivada taluk of the Kistna District.

56 In the Narsapur taluk of the West Godavari District.

57 In the Repalli taluk of the Guntur District.

58 The delta of the river Kistna in the present Divi taluk of the Kistna District.

59 A place of sacred interest to the Andhras, situated at a spot where the southern branch of the Kistna disemboguės.

60 In the Bandar taluk of the Kistna district situated four miles from Masulipatam.

FARM	RENTER.	RENT IN M. PS.
Peta *junkan* and[61] Hyderabad customs.	Mahomed Hussain.	6,000
Masulipatam and Pandraka salt.[62]	,,	20,000
Narsapur town.	Bellapakuduru Kamayya.	525
Arrak farm.[63]	Upparapalli Ramudu.	1,250
	Total M. Ps.	1,12,125
	Do. Rs.	4,48,500

It will be seen from this interesting table, which supplies the first detailed account of the Masulipatam farms under the administration of the East India Company, that the Madras government were masters of all the vital points on the southern coastline of the Sarkars and hence not only commanded vast resources in salt but also effectively controlled the land and sea customs. Renters were permitted to take small farms, in partnership, notwithstanding the fact that each one of them had been a bidder for other farms, and this naturally attracted the best offers since it allowed for a pooling of resources to make a bid look respectable.

In 1762, the farms were again let for a period of one year to practically the same renters as in the previous year.[64] The total gross revenues showed an increase of Rs. 1,84,000. But the net gain to the Company was considerably reduced owing to the fact that as a direct result of the institution of monthly payments the renters had been backward in the discharge of their dues and the three salt farms alone showed a deficit of Rs. 1,21,000.[65]

61 Sea and land customs respectively.

62 Pandraka is situated very near Masulipatam. Both in the Bandar taluk.

63 Liquor license.

64 *Pub Cons.* 24 May and 15 November 1763 Vol. 21 pp. 219 and 428-29 respectively. The Court of Directors approved the continuing of the old renters. See *Madras Dispatches* 30 December 1763, para 106 Vol. II p. 889.

65 *Pub. Cons.* 27 September 1763. Vol. 21 pp. 364-65. On this, the Court of Directors observed that the Masulipatam revenues were "a very considerable sum indeed, but when the heavy expenses of your presidency in their various branches are set against them, the necessity of putting the one upon the best footing and reducing the other in every instance whereever it can be conveniently and safely done is too obvious to dwell upon any further than for recommend(ing) them to your strictest care and attention". *Madras Dispatches* 30 December 1763 para 108 Vol. II Pp. 890-91.

The Madras Government was particularly careful not to add to the strength of any single individual who enjoyed considerable power and influence in the district where a farm was available for rent. Thus when the Raja of Mugalaturru offered to rent the Narsapur farm, they observed that "as we are informed he is a poligar who commands a considerable force, we should prefer giving the rent to any other person of credit who may be inclined to take it on the same rent".[66] This was only to avoid coming into conflict with the powerful raja in case of his being unable to pay the revenue or defraying the Company's slender forces at Masulipatam. As a rule, the renters pressed for an extension of time to pay their *kists* and the Madras Government reluctantly agreed to this proposal notwithstanding their original orders to the contrary,[67]

The year 1764 was a very lean year for the Masulipatam revenues. The disturbances occasioned in the Sarkars by Sitaramarazu attracted fewer renters and lower bid.[68] To counteract this, the Madras Council sought relief in a quinquennial lease. But this was attended with little success and we read that "the offers now made, although for a term of five years, are in general not higher than the farms let out for the last year, and from hence we find that the unsettled situation of those countries disappoints for the present our hopes of raising the value of the farms by letting them for a term of five years.[69] The result of this discouraging prospect was a relapse into the ruinous practice of an annual lease with its attendant features of insecurity, outstanding balances and general severity of administration.

In october 1764 a test case came up for the consideratlon of the Madras Council which profoundly affected the principles of revenue administration at this period.[70] The balance due from the Masulipatam farms amounted to Rs. 1,88,445— of this, Mr. Bakhar, renter of the Nizampatam farm for the four years 1760—1763, was responsible for as much as Rs. 1,44,778. The chief of Masulipatam explained that the farm had been constantly

A test Case

66 *Pub. Cons.* 15 November 1765 Vol, 21 p. 429. But for want of an eligible renter tha raja was granted the lease of their farm. See *Idem* 13 December. *Idem* pp. 27-28.

67 *Ibid.*

68 *Idem* 9 Januaay and 7 April 1764 Vol. 22 pp. 31-32 and 188 respectively.

69 *Idem.* 24 May 1764 Vol. 22 pp. 266-267. The Court of Directors reviewed this measure with scepticism, but permitted the measure and directed Madras 'to take the utmost care that the renters do punctually pay their annual rents according to their stipulated times and not suffered on any pretence whatsoever to be in arrears". See *Madras Dispatches* 4 January 1765 Vol. III. pp. 29-30.

70 *Public Cons.* 30 October 1764. Vol. 22 pp. 531—32. See also *Idem* 16 July 1768, where the evil effects of the overrating of this farm were recalled. Vol. 27, p. 529.

overrated during those years to the extent of Rs. 1,84,830 and hence the inability of Mir Bakhor to pay off his dues. He also explained that nothing could be obtained from the personal effects of this renter. Reviewing this position, the Madras Council expressed their inability to proceed otherwise than by directing the balance to be recovered in full and "constantly carried forward on the books". In this decision is to be found the germ of that evil practice of accumulating balance which in later times not only embarrassed the Madras government and the Court of Directors, but also resulted in the sequestration of important family properties and zamindaries with its concomitant results of distrust and rebellion.

The next year saw the first experiment with a quinquennial lease and the clear definition of the views of the Madras Government on the rights of renters and cultivators. They wrote "As these renters are the servants of the Company it is agreed to write to Mr. Pybus that it will be proper to keep an eye on their management and be careful that they allow the inhabitants their just dues, that the extending of the farms to the term of five yeas should be a further inducement to their improving them by cultivating the lands and avoiding any means of opposition, (on) which supposition only, and to enable them to pay the rents punctually, it is, that we commit the charge of them to their management".71 This declaration shows clearly that the cultivators were regarded as possessing certain customary rights, but it raises and leaves unanswered the important issue whether the cultivators were proprietors of the soil,

The first Quinquennial lease.

Two points of interest are to be noted before we pass on to a study of the dual government in the Sarkars. The first is that, owing to a great scarcity of coin, the Madras gevernment were obliged to supersede the Madras Pagoda, which had been the most widely accepted coin in the Sarkars, with the current or star pagoda which was inferior in value.72 There was an outcry against this innovation, but the

Early Experiments and Reforms.

71 *Pub. Cons.* 27 May 1765. Vol. 23 p. 225.

72 *Idem.* 27 January and 23 February 1967 Vol. 25, p. 35 and p. 99 respectively. See also Prof. N. H. Dodwell's paper on "The substitution of silver for gold in the currency of South India" in the *Indian Journal of Economics* Vol.1II. especially pp. 194—195 (January 1921)

See further *Observations on the Copper Coinage wanted for the Northern Circars* by Alexander Dalrymple, 1774 (I. 6. Tracts Vol. 48) See also *Madras to Masulipatam* 4 April 1765.

Milit. Cons. Col. 42 pp. 297-301 The Company's rate of exchange was fixed at 3¾ rupees a Madras pagoda as against the one of 4¼ rupees a pagoda claimed by the *sahukars* as the natural market rate. Hussain Ali was ordered curiously enough, to pay his balances in rupees. The Current Pagodas were then per cent inferior to the Madras Pagodas.

Madras government struck out a *via media* and resolved that "the inhabitants and shroffs may be persuaded (sic) to receive them on their being assured that the Company will be ready on all occasions to take them again on the same exchange".[73] A good deal of friction had been the result of this policy since the rate of exchange between the Madras and the Current pagodas had to be fixed as often as necessary by the Chief of Masulipatam who was also entrusted with the regulation of the bazaar rate of exchange between rupees and dubbs.[74] But, the revenue accounts were henceforward kept indifferently, sometimes in Madras Pagodas and sometimes in Current Pagodas.

The second point to be noted is that the transit duties collected by the zamindars were strictly limited by the Madras government both in number and extent. This is material point in connection with the land tenures of the Sarkars. From time immemorial, the zamindars had been accustomed to levy and collect certain duties on articles of commerce passing through their territories. Each zamindar had his own barrier and the zamindars were numerous. This chain of frequent and onerous transit duties not only fettered the movements of trade, but also greatly reduced the revenues of the Company. Complaints about this vicious system had been made by the Chief of Masulipatam as early as 1764.[75] But, at a time when the country was in a state of anarchy, the Madras Government were not prepared to create unrest among the zamindas of the Sarkars, who had long been used to this source of revenue as a matter of legitimate right. In 1768, after the two treaties with Nizam Ali had been signed, they declared that "the Zemindars of the Northern Circars are undoubtedly entitled to no other duties than what were usually collected when those countries were under French Government".[76] These duties were abolished later on, but this restraint placed upon zamindars added considerably to the Masulipatam revenues.

Masulipatam Revenues.

The following is a statement of the revenues of the Masulipatam farms for the years 1762 to 1773. The Vizagapatam revenues are also given for the sake of comparison.[77]

73 *Idem* 25 February 1767 Vol. 23 p. 99

74 *Idem.* 22 September 1766. Vol. 24 pp. 472—75

75 In 1765 the Madras Government drew pointed attention to the duties collected by the zamindars and renters at the successive stages of the movements of the Lambadi hawkers of coastal salt. See *Madras letters received* 18 October 1765 (Palk.) para. 79 Vol. II. (pages not numbered).

76 *Pub. Cons.* 18 July 1768. Vol, 27. p. 543

77 Throughout this period, the Company maintained a settlement at Vizagapatam, independent of the authority of the Pusapatis of Vijayanagaram, and the revenues as far as they are available, show mostly the receipts from land and sea customs.

Figures for 1767, 1768 and 1771 are not available.

Revenues of the Masulipatam and Vizagapatam Farms. In M.Ps

Year.	Masulipatam Farms.	Vizagapatam Farms.
1762	1.12,125	...
1763	1,57,700	...
1764	1,04,625	5,858
1765	1,11,445	5,869
1766	1,11,274	5,447
1767	...	...
1768	...	...
1769	1,04,570	6,801
1770	1,40,195	6,687
1771	...	...
1772	1,09,888	6,447
1773	1,09,788	3,987

The sudden fall in 1764 was the effect of the incursions of Sitaramarazu into the Rajahmundry and Ellore Sarkars. The fall in the revenues for 1772 and 1773 was occasioned by a redistribution of the Masulipatam farms in accordance with the general revenue policy adopted in the Sarkars which by that time had come under the complete control of the Madras Government.

Summary.

The results of the revenue administration of these farms may be grouped together as follows: the farming system was uniformly followed; experiments in long leases had been attended with scant success; an attempt had been made to secure to the ryot his just share of the produce; the evils of an ever accumulating balance of revenues had been recognised as inevitable; and finally, an initial attempt had been made to restrain the zamindars from clogging the wheels of commerce and industry. In all these respects, the revenue policy of the Madras government with respect to the Northern Sarkars had been practically identical during the next thirty years.

(To be continued)

THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE KAKATIYAS

Pratapa Rudra (continued).

M. RAMA RAO, B.A. (HON.) B.Ed.

Accession--Prataparudra's claims to the Kakatiya throne rested not on his birth but on his being adopted by his maternal grandmother and predecessor Rudramba. Vidyanatha mentions that his mother was Mummadamba and his father Mahādēva. It is not at present possible to identify this Mahādēva. Historians are under the impression that Pratapa Rudra took up the administration of the empire in 1296 A. D. after his accession. We have already pointed out elsewhere that he was ruling conjointly with Rudramba between 1290-1296 A.D. It must therefore be said that his rule began in 1290 A. D. This fact is borne out by a number of inscriptions.

Rule—Pratapa Rudra seems to have had an eventful reign. Like the reign of Aurangzeb, the great Mogul, it shows the high water mark of Kakatiya glory and also witnesses the inevitable but pitiable reaction in the opposite direction. Time and again, the monarch had to contend against heterogenous forces which in spite of his temporary curbings ultimately blazed forth into a huge conflagration that decimated the whole empire. The reign is a striking example of the presence of the Hand of God in History.

Local Records of the Gandikota region indicate some disturbance in the early part of the reign and associate the Kāyastha feudatories with it. ManmaGandaGopala a Telugu Choda ruler of Nellore, is known to have been a feudatory of PratapaRudra. Ādidamma, a Kakatiya general, claims to have invaded Nellore and worsted its ruler. Ambadēva, the Kayastha feudatory, appears as a friend of ManmaGandaGopala. From these facts it appears that the Choda rebelled with the aid of the Kayastha and that this rebellion was put down by Ādidamma. This was probably a sign of dissatisfaction due to the weak title of Pratapa Rudra to the throne and might be placed very early in the reign, about 1300 A. D.

Just at this time important events were taking place in North India. The throne of Delhi fell into the hands of Alauddin, who had made his mark as a reputed fighter in his compaigns against Devagiri

in 1294. Soon after his accession the Sultan sent a large army *via* Bengal and the East Coast, to continue his work in the Deccan and annex it. But this expedition was repelled by the Eastern Gangas in 1303. However the Sultan sent fresh forces under his trusted lieutenant, Malik Naib Kaffur. The Yadavas of Devagiri, who were the hereditary foes of the Kakatiyas rendered much service and assistance to the invaders.[1] Having come to know of this, Pratapa Rudra dispatched to the North a large contingent of forces under the leadership of valiant generals like Mēcheya Nayaka and Bendapudi Anna. The Andhras crossed the Godavary and met the advancing foe. Ultimately the invaders were defeated and made a retreat to Delhi *via* Devagiri [2]

In the year 1304 there was a rebellion at Gandikota. A careful study of the Local Records reveals many interesting facts. It is said that Ambadeva set up a rebellion in this frontier post. Inscriptions of this general are found only up to 1304. Since that date a certain Sōmayanāyaka figures as the viceroy at Gandikota.[3] These facts lead to the conclusion that Ambadeva tried for the second time to throw off the Kakatiya yoke in that year; but was defeated and probably killed and succeeded by Sōmayanāyaka in the Gandikota region.

Immediately after this domestic disturbance was put down, the monarch had to face the Mahomadans in the North. In 1304. Alauddin sent Malik kaffur to Devagiri to punish its ruler for disobedience. Not content with having accomplished this task and intent upon avenging his former defeat at the hands of the Andhras, the Mahomadan general marched upon Warangal. Unprepared as they were for this attack, the Andhras put up a strong fight and impelled by a strong love of crown and country, tore their opponents to pieces. Kaffur was forced to beat a second retreat to the North.

The period from 1304—1309 is the most glorious in the reign of Pratapa Rudra. With the internal disorder effectively checked and the external foe completely repelled, the country enjoyed undisturbed peace and security; consequently intellectual activity of an unprecedented type set in. The ruler was himself a great scholar and a lover of learning. Poets, scholars, artists and talented men swarmed to his court like bees. Pratapa Rudra encouraged Sanskrit, Telugu and Canarese too and liberally

1 Much valuable information regarding the Mahomadan invasions of Warangal, is available from three important documents— "Nub Siphir" and "Tarikh-i-Alai" of Amir Khusru; "Tarikh-i-Firoz shahi" of Barani; and "Tarikh-i-Firoz shahiji" of Shams-i-Siraj Affib. Traditional Telugu Histories like the Pratapacharitram etc., also give their own versions.

2 Mahomadan histories which credit the Muslims with success in this campaign, are untrustworthy.

3 cf. L. R. Gandikota

patronised all the sciences and arts. A number of eminent literary works were composed at his court and many fine pieces of sculpture executed at his command. It looked as though the times of Raja Raja the chalukya and Manmasiddhi of Nellore were being reproduced on a much larger scale or the age of Krishnarāya of Vizayanagar was being rehearsed.

The persistent victories of the Andhras were an eyesore to the Yadavas. The latter informed Alauddin that the Andhras had run intellectually mad and instigated him to a fresh attack. Accordingly the Sultan sent Malik kaffur to the South, with large forces in 1309. Amir khusru, the Mahomadan historian, narrates how the Muslim hordes marched through Masūdpūr, Khandar, and Nilkhant, experiencing innumerable difficulties on the way and entered the Kakatiya Empire. They captured Sirpūr and Kunarpāl and finally encamped at Anmakonda and surrounded Warangal. In spite of the horrible resistence on the part of the Andhras, the Mahomadans were able, by dint of their superior methods of warfare and tenacity of purpose, to capture the impregnable mud wall that enclosed the fort and laid sieze to the stone enclosure within. Being suddenly attacked and completely blockaded by the enemy, the Andhras were constrained to sue for peace. Prataparudra agreed to submit to the Sultan of Delhi, and to pay him an annual tribute. Large sums of money and vast treasures were given to the Muslim general as compensation. Thus ended the third invasion of the Mahomadans in the month of March 1310 A.D.[4]

Hard on the heels of this calamity came fresh trouble from the South and South West which kept the monarch busy between 1311-1314. In 1311 the Pandyas invaded Kānchi, drove away Vīra Ganda Gopala and occupied it. Pratapa Rudra dispatched two of his valiant generals to retrieve this loss. One of them was Yerradachānāyadu of the Recherla family of the Padmanayakas, who is credited with having defeated the Pandyas and carried away their treasures. The other was Rudra of the Indulūri family who is said to have defeated the five Pandyas.[5]

By 1314, however, the situation became worse. Ravivarman, the ruler of Kērala, invaded Kanchi, drove away the Pandyas and the Kakatiya feudatory also and occupied it. With undaunted courage the Kakatiya monarch dispatched Muppidinayaka to the South. This general was able to clear the ground of all enemies and place Māna Vīra a member of the Telugu choda lineage, on the throne of Kanchi by 1316 A.D.

4 The Muslim account of this incident abounds in exaggerations while the Hindu version, which claims success for the Andhras, is not reliable.

5. Ref. *Sivayōgasaramu* (Introduction.)

Two more incidents of significance took place at this time. We have previously stated how the Padmanayakas were patronized by the Kakatiya monarch and were showing great valour and courage. Yerra Dachānayaka and Muppidi Nayaka continued the tradition in this reign. Being hard pressed by enemies repeatedly, Pratapa Rudra gave the Padmanayakas his exclusive patronage and made them heads of all his seventy seven departments of state. This naturally roused the ire of the other communities and especially the Reddis who were enjoing considerable political power previously. The traditional histories of Gandikota mention that in that region the *Odde* chieftains fomented a rebellion aided by other potentates. We might infer from it that the Reddis expressed their resentment at the king's communal policy by throwing their lot with these odde chiefs. The fact that PrōlayaVēmaReddi deserted his suzerain in a critical situation in 1320 lends support to this view. Pratapa Rudra is said to have personally visited this place and this proves the seriousness of the situation. Local Records show that Sōmayanāyaka governed Gandikota till 1313 and was succeeded by Gonkā Reddi in 1315. This rebellion must have taken place therefore in 1314.

Tradition and the Local Records throw much light on the movements of the king during the next five years. He is said to have ordered the distruction of many forests in the Cuddapah and Kurnool Districts, and brought the land under cultivation. These economic measures were adopted by the king in order to replenish his treasury which was seriously effected by the Mahomadan invasions. Pratapa Rudra is also said to have gone on an extensive pilgrimage to many holy places. Tradition carries him as far south as Rāmēsveram. Inscriptions however prove his presence at Srisailam and Tripurantakam in the Telugu Country, Sri Rangam and Jembukesveram in the Tamil Country, and the Siva Ganga hill in the Tumkur taluk of modern Mysore. Whether he visited these foreign lands as a conqueror and if so under what circumstances, is a question that has to be decided by future researches.

The year 1319 marks the last peaceful and prosperous year in the reign of Pratapa Rudra. Shortly after that the monarch and the Andhra Country were drawn into a whirlpool of troubles and misfortunes from which the latter was able to recover not till many years elapsed and in which the former succumbed. In 1320 there was trouble from both within and without the empire, simultaneously. The small kingdom of Kampila was making rapid advances with the numerous victories of its valiant young prince Kumāra Rama. In that year the prince solicited the help of Pratapa Rudra, against the Hoysalas but the monarch refused help on the ground that the Hoysalas were his friends. There upon Rama

besiezed the southern borders of the Kakatiya Empire. Singamanayaka of the Recherla family and Annāmātya were sent against Kampila. The Kakatiyas ultimately won a decisive victory.[6]

At this very time the Reddis were busy hatching up a fresh conspiracy. Soon, news arrived at Warangal, of a Mahomadan attack. Consequently the king was busy gathering his scattered forces. The Reddis whose ambition was formerly thwarted at Gandikota, took advantage of this opportunity, concentrated at Amaravati and proclaimed independence. A small detachment was however sent against them by Pratapa Rudra but was easily worsted by the powerful rebels. This was the first nail in the coffin of the Kakatiya Empire.

Since the victory of Malik kaffur in 1310 at Warangal, Delhi underwent many violent political changes. The crown waded through much blood and finally settled on the forehead of Ghias-ud-din of the Tuglak dynasty. In 1320, immediately after his accession, this Sultan revived the policy of Alauddin and sent a strong force under his son Ulgukhan to capture and reduce the Andhra kingdom and its ruler. Ziuddin Barni gives a detailed account of this expedition.[7] After strenuous fighting the Mahomadans seem to have reached the point of victory when a terrible disaster overtook them. Mutual jealousies of the leaders and a false rumour about the death of the Sultan made the forces desert the field all of a sudden. Taking advantage of this providential interference, the Andhras routed many of the retreating foes. This was in 1321.

In 1322 was struck the final blow at Warangal and many things conspired to effect it. The Andhras were too much elated with their accidental victory in the previous year and were off their guard, in spite of their knowledge and experience of the Mahomadan policy of persistent and frequent attacks. The Sultan sent a large contingent to his son who was biding his time at Devagiri and spurred him on to a fresh attack on the Andhra capital. The Yadavas helped the invaders as usual. Ziuddin Barni makes light work of his description of this expedition and its results. According to him Ulgukhan was easily able to capture the mud wall of the Warangal fort and lay sieze to the stone wall. Alarmed at this the ruler surrendered, was taken prisoner and speedily dispatched to Delhi while the Mahomadan general followed him with the priceless treasures of the Warangal treasury. This Muslim

6 The exploits of Kumara Rama are known from two Canarese Mss. reviewed in Q. J. M. S. XXI. pt. ii. The Bhimakhanda of the Telugu poet Sreenatha is also useful in tracing the relation between the Kakatiyas and the ruler of Kampila.

7 Elliot — vol. III. p. 231

victory does not seem to have been so easily won, though internal dissentions, the death of many valiant generals in previous wars, and the generally weakened condition of the forces in the Andhra camp, might have made the task of the Muslim general considerably easy. The traditional histories of the Kakatiyas give a different and perhaps a more reliable version of this war. The Padmanayakas bore the brunt of the war and got the lion's share of glory. This enraged the battallion of Reddis who still remained in the service of Pratapa Rudra and these entered into negotiations with the Mahomadans. Having received a wholesome bribe, these Reddis under the leadership of Babba Reddi suddenly deserted the Andhra king when the fortunes of war were hanging in the balance. Dismayed at this, Pratapa Rudra rushed to the field with a handful of followers. Ulgukhan consummated his *coup* by rushing upon the monarch and capturing him. And thus set the Kakatiya sun about the middle of the year 1323 A. D.

The unfortunate monarch was taken prisoner to Delhi. It is generally supposed that he died in the same year. Mahomadan writers say that he died on the way. Both these suppositions are wrong. There are at least two inscriptions which prove that Pratapa Rudra was ruling at Warangal in 1326 A.D. One of them records a grant by the general Rudra[8] while the other registers a gift by a Reddi Chieftain.[9] There is besides, a strong tradition which credits a minister of Pratapa Rudra with having released his master from the prison and restored him to the Kakatiya throne. However the monarch does not seem to have long survived this humiliation. Being born in 1254 A.D. he was sixty nine years old by the time he was captured and the latest we hear of him is in his seventy second year. It is not improbable therefore that the monarch died in 1326 A. D.

Literary patronage—The ages of Raja Raja and Manmasiddhi mark two important epochs in the development of Telugu Literature. The reign of Pratapa Rudra marks a distinct epoch in the evolution of Telugu and Sanskrit literature in the Andhra country. The names of many Sanskrit poets that adorned this monarch's court are known from extant works. Vidyānātha the famous author of the popular work on rhetoric known as "Pratapa Rudra yaśōbhūshana" flourished at Warangal. The name of a certain Mallinatha, a famous *śatāvadhāni* is known from Narayana Pandita's champū-rāmayana Vyakhyā. The poet Agastya is said to have lived at Warangal and written seventy seven Kayyas. Gangādhara, the author of Bāla Bharata, Narasimha, the writer of Kādambarī Nātaka, Viswanātha, the

8 E. R. No. 308 of 1915.
9 The Reddikula Nirnayachandrika p. 88—89.

author of Saugandhikāpaharana Vyāyōga, Vīrabhallata Dēsika of many sided scholarship[10] and Appayārya, the Jain poet who wrote Jinendra Kalyāṇābhyudaya[11]— all these Sanskrit poets received the patronage of Pratapa Rudra. The names of many contemporary Telugu poets are also known. Tippana alias Tripurantaka, the author of Prēmābhirāma lived at Warangal, in this monarch's reign. Mārana wrote the Mārkandeya Purana and dedicated it to Nāgaya Gannaya a general of the Emperor. The famous poet Bhāskara and his associates Mallikārjuna, Kumāra-Rudra and Ayyalārya composed the Bhāskara Ramayana and dedicated it to Sāhini Māra the Emperor's commander of cavalry forces. Thus this reign witnessed literary effervescence of an unprecedented kind.

Chapter VI.

Successors of Pratapa Rudra.

After the capture in 1323 and death in 1326 of Pratapa Rudra, the Kakatiya empire was torn into pieces. We have already shown how communal jealousy lead to the secession of the Reddis and the establishment of their independence at Vinukonda as early as 1320. It is not possible to say with any amount of certainty who the immediate successor of Pratapa Rudra was. The Local Records mention Juttaya Lanka Gonka Reddi as a son of the monarch while the Uparpalli inscription calls him Juttaya.[12] According to Elliot, Virabhadra son and successor of Pratapa Rudra, retired to Kondavidu in 1323.[13] The Muslim historians speak of a Vināyakadēva alias Nāgadēva.[14] Ziuddin Barni calls a Kanha Naik son of 'Ludder Deo' and Sewell calls him Krishna.[15] Traditional histories say that Pratapa Rudra had two sons called Vīrabhadra and Virupaksha. His brother Annamadeva is said to have fled to the N. E. and carved out a small principality for himself. Probably Pratapa Rudra had more than one son who after his death, divided among themselves, the territory round Warangal. Of these Krishna or Kanha Naik seems to have held Warangal city and probably he was the Hindu king of Warangal from whom Alauddin Hussan the first Bahmani Sultan exacted tribute.

10 I am much indebted to Mr. Veturi Prabhakara Sastry for help in this connection.

11 Cat. of Sans. & Prak. MSS in C. P. and Berar, p. XXXVII.

12 I. A. XXXVII, p. 357

13 Coins of Southern India p. 84

14 I. A. XXXVII, p. 357. ff 22

15 Antiquities II, p. 174

The Padmanayakas concentrated at Devarakonda and Rajakonda and established themselves there. The Reddis shifted from Amaravati to Addanki and from there to Kondavidu and there established an independent kingdom. In the Godavary region Prolayanayaka repelled the Mahomadans and established a small principality. The greater part of the Kakatiya empire was thus divided. The Southern and South western part came to be transformed into the famous Vijayanagar Empire.

Conclusion.

Thus, the small principality of the Kakatiyas which rose to fame about the middle of the 11th century, came to a sudden end in the first quarter of the 14th century. It came into being on the ruins of the Vēngi Empire, and then passed under the Western Chalukyan yoke for a time. Through the untiring zeal of Prōla and Rudra, this small principality so expanded as to include the whole of the Telingāna and the Godavary, Kistna, Guntur and Kurnool Districts of the Madras Presidency. This expansion synchronised with the establishment of the independence of the Kakatiyas. Under Ganapati, all the Northern Circars as well as Southern Kalinga in the N. E., the Ceded Districts in the S. W. and Thondai mandalam for a time were finally annexed. Pratāpa Rudra held all these dominions firmly and for a time intruded into South India also. Thus, this Andhra Empire in the heyday of its glory included the whole of the territory lying between the Southern portions of C. P. and Berar, the Ganjam District, Sri Rangam, the Tumkur Tq. of Mysore, Raichur and Kalyan in the West. On its remains arose the later Andhra principalities of the Padmanāyakas, the Reddis and Vijayanagar.

(Concluded)

THE HISTORY OF THE EASTERN GANGAS OF KALINGA.

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

Chapter V.

(Continued from page 216, Vol. VI Parts 3 and 4).

Anantavarma Chōḍagaṅga had his capital at Kalinganagara till 1135 A. D. In that year, he returned to his capital, Nagaram, after subduing the Western, Northern and Eastern countries and bringing the whole country lying between the Ganges and the Godavari rivers under his firm control.94 He took up the title of *Chakravarti* (Emperor). He paid a visit to the holy god Srīkūrmanātha of Srīkūrmam in the Ganjam District before returning to his capital. Shortly after, he seems to have removed his capital to Cuttack. The *Mādalāpānji* or the Jagannath Chronicle states that Chōḍagaṅga defeated the last king of the Kēśari Dynasty named Suvarṇa Kēśari with the help of his minister, Vāsudeva Bāhampati in A.D. 1134 and succeeded to the Utkala kingdom and transferred his capital to Cuttack. The causes for the transfer of his capital to Cuttack may be the following: —

1 The extension of his Empire to the river Bāgirathi--Ganges in the north, thus necessitating the removal of the capital also to the north so that Utkala and with it the Oḍras might be subdued fully.

2 The necessity to overcome the opposition of the Kalachuris of Chedi who were ruling in the western regions defying the authority of the E. Gangas.

3 The decline of the power of the Chalukya — Chōḍas in the Vengi country, especially after the death of Kulōttunga Chōladeva in 1118 A. D. when his son Vikramachōla who was the Viceroy of Vengi retired to the south, leaving the kingdom in the hands of the Velanāṭi Chōḍas.

The Emperor's Korni95 and Visag96 Plates, dated A. D. 1112 and 1118 respectively, state clearly that he first replaced the fallen Lord of Utkala in the Eastern region and then the waning lord of Vengi in the Western region and restored their fortunes. So, even before 1118

94 S. I. Inscrr. Vol. V, No. 1335
95 J. A. H. R. S. Vol. I, Pp. 118—123.
96 I. A. Vol. XVIII, Pp. 165—172.

A. D, when Kulōttungachōla died, Anantavarma got control over Utkala and Vengi. Though he did not annex them to his empire, he interfered in the affairs of those kingdoms so successfully that their lords must have formed friendly subordinate alliances with him. The Pittapur Inscription of Mallapadeva[97] states that, after Kulottungachōla's death in A.D. 1118 when his son Vikramachōla left the Vengi viceroyalty in the hands of the Velanati chola chief named Kulottunga Rajendrachoda and retired to the South, Vengi kingdom was distracted with anarchy, civil strife and foreign invasions. That part of the kingdom lying to the north of the R. Godavari became the bone of contention between the Velnati chiefs of Guntur District and the E. Ganga Emperor, until, by A. D. 1135, Anantavarma conquered and annexed that county as stated clearly in his Srikūrmam inscription. Vikramāditya VI of the Western Chalukyan dynasty, who had no love for the Chola kings, invaded Vengi after the death of Kulottunga and conquered it and ruled over it between A.D. 1120 and 1125 as witnessed by the presence of his inscriptions in the Draksharama temple.[98] After his death, Kulottunga got his final chance and probably then he took possession of the whole country extending up to the river Godavari. In other words, the South Kalinga country comprising the modern Visag and E. Godavari districts passed under his control. In proof of this, we can cite that in A.D. 1128, he and his several wives visited the God of Drākshārāma and made gifts.[99] Seven years later, in A. D. 1135, he made a virtual conquest of the whole region and annexed it to his Empire.[100] At the same time, he annexed Utkala and transferred his capital to Cuttack as stated in the Mādalā Pānji.

From certain inscriptions of Cholas and Velnati-cholas found in the same temple, we learn that the latter, as the viceroys of the former, made attempts to conquer Kalinga country and actually claim to have won victories. But, in the long run, the mighty arm of Anantavarma triumphed. Thus, the decline of the E. Chalukyan Empire, which began after the death of Rāja Raja Narendra in A.D. 1063, gave an opportunity to the E. Ganga Rāja Rāja to interfere in the affairs of Vengi and insert the thin end of the wedge. When, in 1070 A. D., Kulottunga succeeded to the Chola throne Vengi was ruled by his viceroys till 1118 A. D. and this gave better chance to Anantavarma to extend his power. However, as pointed out already, this extension of power was challenged first by Vikramaditya VI and then by the Velnati Chiefs until, by 1135 A.D., Anantavarma fully succeeded in extending his rule to the R. Godavari

97 Ep, Ind. Vol. IV, p. 229

98 S. I. Inscrr. Vol. IV, Nos. 207, 258 and 331.

99 S. I. Inscrr. Vol. IV, Nos. 1190—99.

100 S, I. Inscrr. Vol. V, No. 1335.

in the south. Vengi Proper, lying between the Rivers Godavari and Krishna continued to be under the rule of the Velnati chiefs till the close of the 12th century when it passed under Kakatiya control.

An inscription found in the Drakshārāma Temple[101] states that in A. D. 1116 Kulottunga had the title of *Gañga Kāvēri paryanta Dharitrīpati* (Lord of the Earth lying between the River Ganges and the River Kaveri). An inscription found in the Nādindla Temple[102] in Guntur District states that Velnaṭi Choda conquered Kalinga Gañga Kaṭakam. This may refer to a mere raid led by him to Katakam, the new capital of the Later E. Gangas and this view is confirmed by the fact that they continued to enjoy uninterrupted rule there. An undated inscription, found in the Drakhārāma temple,[103] states that a certain Pōtarāju of the Kōna dynasty who was a Vassal of Rajendrachoda conquered Tri-Kalinganādha and obtained 1000 villages in Vengi as a reward. It is probable that this event occured before Rajendrachoda's death in A.D. 1118. An examination of the contents of these inscriptions only confirms the view expressed already that, after the death of Kulottunga in A. D. 1118, the Chola-Chalukya power over the country lying to the north of the R. Godavari, began to decline and after the death of Vikramachola in A. D. 1135 it fell altogether. Hence, the Sri-Kurmam inscription[104] must be believed in its entirety. It is a very important record because, firstly, it reveals the fact that Anantavarma conquered the three Quarters in 1135 A.D. and extended his rule over a vast region and secondly, that he visited the Srīkurmam temple and made rich gifts to the God and to the Brahmins and thirdly that he returned to his capital, Nagaram. In the same year, he transferred his capital from Nagaram to Cuttack in the North.

So far, five C. P. Grants[105] of this Emperor have been edited and a sixth[106] was noticed briefly.

101 S. I. I. Vol. IV, No. 1029 102 S. I. I. Vol. IV, No. 662.
103 S I. I. Vol. IV, No. 1153. 104 S. I. I. Vol. V, No. 1335.

105. The Visag C.P. Grant of S' 1003 in I.A. Vol. 18 pp. 161-165; The Visag C. P grant of S' 1040 in I.A. Vol. 18. Pp. 165—172; The Korni C.P. Grant of S. 1003 in J.A.H.R.S. Vol. I, pp. 40—48. The Korni C.P. Grant of S. 1034 in J.A.H. R. S. Vol. 1, pp. 106—124; The Visag C.P. Grant of S. 1057 in I.A. Vol. 18, pp. 172—176;

106. C. P. Grant No. 6 of A. R. on S. I Ep. for 1918—19 dated S. 1006.

The late Mr. R. D. Banerji in his *History of Orissa*, Vol I, devoted four Chapters (pp. 226 -270) for writing an account of the Eastern Gañgas, which are very defective on account of his not drawing upon all the Sources available, particularly, the several C. P. Grants of the Early and Later Ganga kings published in J. A. H. R. S. by several scholars, the several copper-plate and stone inscriptions relating to the Gañga kings noticed in Annual Reports on S. I. Epigraphy, Madras and the several hundreds of inscriptions found in the S. I.

(1) The Visagapatam Copper-Plate Grant of Ś. 1003 (A. D. 1081) gives the date of accession of the Emperor as Ś. 999 expired, Saturday 17th Feb. 1078. He had the title of *Tri-Kalingādhi-pati*. It is a Sanskrit record written in South Indian Nagari characters. The seal has the image of a couchant *Nandi* (Bull) and on either side of it a *chauri* (Elephant-goad) and a conch-shell and other emblems. It is clear from the symbols on the seal that the Emperor was a follower of Saivite cult. The grant was issued from Kalinganagara, the capital. It consisted of the gift of the village of Chākivāḍa in the Samva district to the *Linga* (Phallus) form of God Siva called Rāja Rājēśvara for the purpose of performing *Bali*, *Pūja*, *Nivēdya*, and *Utsavam* ie, the oblation of ghee, the worship, the perpetual oblation and the festival of God respectively. The temple was in the village of Rengujeda. Dr. Fleet rightly thought that the God was established in that village by Rāja Rāja, the father of the donor. Probably, it was constructed in imitation of the Rāja Rājēśvara Temple at Tanjore, built by the Chola Emperor Rāja Rāja, after whom the E. Ganga Rāja Rāja was named. The use of solar months in this inscription is also in imitation of a similar system found among Tamils. The Plates record the geneology of the E. Ganga Line from Guṇamahārṇava to the Donor.[107] and mention that the Gañgas are of *Atrēya gōtra*. It is noteworthy that the king calls together an assembly of all the people of the village headed by *Amātyas* (Ministers) and proclaims his gift in their presence.

(2) The Korni C. P. Grant of the same king which belongs to the same year Ś. 1003 (A. D. 1081) gives the same geneology as that given in the Visag Grant noted above. Both are in Sanskrit and the Seals of both give the same emblems. The village of Korni, where this set and another dated Ś. 1034 came to the discovered in 1924, is near Kalingapatam at the mouth of R. Vamśadhāra.

The list of Gañga kings given here, from Guṇamahārnava onwords. agrees with similar lists found in the Visag C. P. Grants of the same king dated Ś. 1003 and Ś. 1057 and in all those of his grand.

Inscrr. Vols. IV, V, and VI which relate to the Gangas. He based his entire Chapter on "the Fall of Gangas" on the late Mr. M. Chakravarti's "*Chronology of the E. Gañga kings of Orissa*" in J. A. S. B. Vol. LXXII with all its limitations and shortcomings. It is regrettable that several of his statements are wrong and hasty. His *Appendix* on p. 257 is wholly wrong and misleading. Not only did he fail to make use of the several articles published in J. A. H. R. S. on the subject but he also wrongly mentioned two of the Grants really belonging to Vajrahasta as belonging to Anantavarma and drew absurd conclusions therefrom.

107 Vide the Geneologica1 Table given already, on p. 273 of Vol. V, J.A.H.R.S.

father, Vajrahasta. The list of Gañga kings found in the second set of Korni plates dated Ś. 1034 agrees with a similar list given in the Visag plates of the same king dated Ś. 1040 and both trace the Line from Vishnu and Moon and both contain many mythological and Puranic names which cannot be accepted as historically true.

This Korni Grant of Ś 1003 records the gift of the village of Khōnna (same as Korni) by the king to 300 Brahmins, well-versed in *Yajanādi Shaṭkarma*, (the six religious rites), on second April 1082 A.D. It is believed that the Kālingi Brāhmans, now living in the village, may be the descendants of the original Donees. The modern villages of Omaravilli. Tōnangi, Korlam, Tūlugu and Gāra—all in the Ganjam District—are mentioned in this record as forming the boundary villages of Korni.

The Record gives the following history of the respective kings and extols the virtues of the dynasty:—

The Gañgas belonged to the Atrēya *gōtra*. They enjoyed universal sovereignty with the royal insignia of Conch-shell, Drum, Five Mahāśabdas, Royal Umbrella, Golden chowrie and Bull-crest. They worshipped Gōkarṇaswāmi (Śiva) seated on the summit of Mahēndragiri. They were the Lords of Tri-Kalinga country.

The first king was Guṇamahārṇava or Guṇārṇava who was succeeded by Vajrahasta. He ruled for 44 years. His son, Guṇḍama for 3 years and then his younger brother Kāmārṇava for 35 years and then his younger brother, Vinayāditya for 3 years ruled over the country. Then, Kāmārṇava's son Vajrahasta who presented a thousand elephants to applicants succeeded and ruled for 35 years. Then, his eldest son Kāmārṇava for 1/2 year and then Kāmārṇava's younger brother Guṇḍa for 3 years and his step-brother Madhukāmārṇava for 19 years enjoyed the earth. Then, the son, born to Kāmārṇava by Vinayamahādēvi of Vaidumba family, called Vajrahasta, who smote with his sword the thunderbolt falling from Heaven, ruled for 33 years. His son, RājaRāja, comparable to Kubēra, ruled for 8 years. Then, his son, born to Rajasundari daughter of Rājēndrachōla, called Chōḍagañga succeeded, being annointed in Ś. 999. From Kalinganagara, the illustrious Anantavarma who had the titles of *Paramamāhēśvara*, *Paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *Mahārājādhirāja* and *Tri-Kalingādhipati* assembled his people headed by the Ministers and granted, for the religious merit of himself and his parents, the village of Khōnna, lying in the district of Varāhavartani (Chicacole), free of all taxes and obstacles, to 300 Brahmins learned in the 6 religious rites viz, performing and helping others to perform sacrifices, studying and helping others to study Vedas and granting and receiving gifts.

The Record was composed by Dāmōdara, son of Māvuraya who is called *Mahākhāyastha* or Accountant and *Sandhivigrahi* or Secretary for war and peace. It was engraved by Vallēmōja, the Chief smith,

(3) The Korni C,P. Grant of this king dated Ś. 1034 (A.D. 1113) is more important historically than the one of Ś. 1003. It resembles the Visag grant of Ś. 1040 in the use of old Tel-Kannaḍa alphabet and the supply of the full geneology and history of kings from Vishnu and Moon.

While referring to the grant made in Ś.1003, it records the gift of a piece of land to the Brahmins living in Khōnna. As pointed out by the Editor of this Grant, the reference to Vajrahasta's being the grantor might be interpreted in this way, that, while he made an oral grant already, Anantavarma confirmed and recorded it in Ś. 1003.

It was already stated that the mythological portion of the geneological table would not be believed.[108] The first historical person appears to be Veerasimha who claims to have conquered Chōla, Pānḍya, *Sapta* Kōnkaṇa, Kerala, Karnāṭa and Lāta countries. He had 5 sons, viz, Kāmārṇava, Dānārṇava, Guṇarnava, Mārasimha and Vajrahasta. *Kāmārṇava*, finding that his kingdom was usurped by his paternal uncle and disliking to violate *Dharma*, set out with his 4 brothers eastwards and reaching Mahendragiri worshipped Gōkarṇaswami and obtaining through his favour all the insignia of royal power, descended on Sabarāditya[109] and defeating him took Kalinga. He made Dantavura[109] his capital· Annointing Dānārṇava as the crown prince and giving Ambavāḍi to Guṇārṇava, Sōda to Mārasimha, Kanṭaka to Vajrahasta, he ruled over Kalinga for 36 years and then *Dāṇārṇava* ruled for 40 years. His son, *Kāmārṇava II* ruled for 50 years with *Nagara* as his capital. He built a lofty temple there for the phallus or *linga* form of Iśa or Śiva and called it Madhukeśa. His son, *Raṇārṇava* for 5 years and then, his elder son, *Vajrahasta II* for 15 years and his younger son *Kāmārṇava III* for 19 years enjoyed the earth. His son, *Guṇārnava* for 27 years and then his son, *Potamkuśa* for 15 years and the latter's brother's son *Kalingalankuśa* for ruled over Kalinga. Then, Guṇārṇava's sons, *Guṇḍama*, *Kāmārṇava* and 12 years *Vinayāditya* ruled for 7, 25 and 3 years respectively, Then, *Vajrahasta IV* succeeded and ruled for 35 years. It is a suspicious point as to why this long Geneology before Guṇārṇava has been omitted in the two Plates of this king dated Ś.1003 and in that of Ś. 1057 and in all the Plates of his grandfather Vajrahasta. There are several discrepancies and mistakes. For example, Vajrahasta I is not at all mentioned. Vajrahasta III is made the son of Madhukāmārṇava as opposed to the statement contained in all the other grants that he is the son of Kāmārṇava. Several of the names of kings mentioned as having ruled before Guṇārnava – the first authentic sovereign of the *Later* Ganga Line of Kalinga—recall to our

108 J.A.H.R.S, Vol. V pp. 262—264, and J.A.H.R.S. Vol. VI, p. 200 ff.

109 J.A.H.R.S. Vol I. p. 108. The Editor very rightly points out, with the help of facsimilis, that *Balâditya* and *Jantavura*, as given by Dr. Fleet, are wrong·

mind those of the Early Gañga Line. Hence, in the Geneology and Chronology already given, the order of kings with their regnal periods, as it appears in all the plates commencing with Guṇārṇava, was accepted and published.[110] The historical account of the Later Gañga kings from Guṇārṇava to Anantavarma was also given.[111]

The importance of this C. P. Grant of Ś. 1034 lies in the fact that Anantavarma, the jewel of the Gañga race is stated to have first replaced the fallen Lord of Utkala in the Eastern region and then the waning Lord of Vēngi in the Western Region and restored their fortunes. The illustrious Anantavarma is credited with the titles of *Mahārāja*, *Rājādhirāja*, *Rājaparamēṣwara*, *Paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *Paramamāhēśwara*, *Paramavaishṇava*, *Paramabrahmaṇya* and *Mātapitṛ pā lánu lhyāta* and *Chōḍagañgadēva*. He assembled all the heads of families (*Kuṭumbinas*) and chiefs of territorial units (*Rāshtrakūṭa Pramukhas*) living in the District of Varāhavartani as well as the Priest, (*Purōhita*), Minister (*Amātya*), Crown Prince (*Yuvarāja*), Secretary for war and peace (*Sandhivigrahi*), chief of royal attendants (*Dauvārika pramukha*) and other officials of the State and made known to them that his grand-father Vajrahasta granted in Ś. 1003 the village of Khōnna with rights over Muṇḍaparru village to 300 Brahmins learned in the 6 religious rites and that a land measuring 88 *vrittis* (shares) taken from Tulupu as the substitute of Muṇḍaparru portion, viz. hamlet of Gāra already resumed, was granted by him in Ś. 1034, at the time of winter solstice (*Uttarāyana-sankrānti*) to the Brahmans of Khonna village.

The text was composed by Śāsanādhikāri Jātavēdibhaṭṭa and engraved by Bhaṭṭēnāchārya, son of Vellenāchārya.

4 The C. P. Grant of this king dated Ś. 1040 gives the same historical information as the one dated Ś. 1034. Its seal contains the images of a couchant bull, and in front of it sun and moon, *linga* on an *abhishēka* stand, umbrella, conch-shell, drum etc. It is also written in old Telugu-Kannaḍa letters. It gives the same set of geneology as the one of Ś, 1034. But Dr. Fleet, the editor of this grant, as stated by Prof. G. V. Seetapati, B. A., with the help of the published facsimilis of plates,[112] wrongly read certain names, e. g. *Balāditya* for *Sabarāditya*, *jantavura* for *Dantavura*, *Jitamkuśa* for *Pōtamkuśa* and *Trimśata* for *Triyastrimśata*.

The grant was made, in the presence of the same set of officials, to Mādhava Nāyaka, the grandson of Vasudeva Nāyaka, a royal dependent, for the merit of the king and his parents in Ś. 1040 (A, D. 1118). The donees were Vaishnavas and the king's title *Parama vai-*

110 J.A.H.R.S. Vol. V, p. 276.
111 J.A H.R.S. Vol. VI p. 200 ff.
112 J. A. H. R. S. Vol. I, p. 108

-*shnava* shows that he professed about this time the cult of Vishnu and so made gifts to Vaishnavas. It is interesting to note that the king, in this charter dated A. D. 1118, treats himself as decorated with the rank of the entire Sovereignty over the whole of Utkala. Probably, he conquered it about this time. But when it is remembered that in his Srikurmam inscription dated A. D. 1135 he refers to his newly made conquests of three quarters including Utkala, it will be believed that till that year his Sovereignty was not fully established over that country.

This grant was not made from Kalinganagara but only from Sindhurapura. The village granted was called Tāmarakhandi and it was situated in the district of Samva. It was given away with all its hamlets including its water and dry lands, free from all obstacles and taxes and made into an Agrahāra for ever.

5. Another grant of this king dated Ś, 1057 (A. D. 1135) resembles that of his Visag and Korni Plates, both dated in Ś. 1003. The characters of all these three plates are in South Indian Nagari. The language is Sanskrit. The images on the seals of the three Grants are also the same. Practically, the present charter, excepting the donative portion, is the same as those of Ś. 1003. This grant which was made from Kalinganagara consists of the village of Samuda with its hamlet of Tirlingi in the Sammaga *Vishaya* in Kalingadēśa. It was made to Chōḍagañga, son of Permādiraja and Mamkama. This is a very interesting and important historical fact which confirms the information contained in some of the stone inscriptions found in Narayanapuram,[113] Drākshārāma[114] and Mukhalingam[115] Temples. These Temple Inscriptions state that Anantavarma Chodaganga had a brother named UlagiyamVamda (Ulayigaṇḍa) Permādideva who had a son named Peddajiyyanāyani Chōḍagañga. (Rajēndrachōḍadēva) They were both holding the position of *Mahāmaṇḍalikas* or Provincial Governors during the period A. D. 1132—39.[116] Since the gift of the village of Sammuda with its hamlet of Tirlingi (in Tekkali Taluq) was made to Chōḍagañga, son of Permādi Raja in A. D. 1135, and since their stone inscriptions state that they were related to Anantavarma and acted as Governors in the Northern Province, it has to be inferred that the grant was made for the loyal military services rendered by these close relations of the Emperor. Probably, they helped him in the conquest of Utkala in the same year.

(6) The C. P. Grant dated Ś. 1006 of this king "registers the gift of the village of Sellada in the Rūpavartani *vishaya* (Tekkali Taluq) to Komārachendra, son of Nannipāngu and grandson of Vallanapāngu, a resident of Tālagrama for worship, offerings and lamps of the Goddess Bhagavati of Sellada village for the repair of the temple."

113 An, Rep. on S. I. Ep. for 1926—27, pp. 19, 20, 22, 112, Nos. 649, 650, 651, 657, 688, and 690.

The inscriptions of Ulayigaṇḍa-Permâḍirâju or Pedda-Permâḍirâju and of his son Râjêndrachôladêva or Chôdagañga relate to the grant of 5 *madas* for Neelêśwaradêva of Nirumjeruvu (Bobbili Taluq of Visag District.)

114 S.I. Inscrr. Vol.IV,No, 1186. 115 S.I. Inscrr. Vol.V,Nos, 1015 and 1019.

116 J, A. H. R. S. Vol. VI, pp. 212—216.

REVIEWS.

(a) ROCK-CUT TEMPLES AROUND BOMBAY
BY K. H. VAKIL

PUBLISHERS:– D. B. TARAPOREVALA SONS & Co., BOMBAY.

Price Rs. 3.

The book deals with the several artistic monuments found in Western India— the Cave temples at Elephanta, Jogeshwari, Kanheri and Mandapeshwar which contain sculptural and architectural beauties rarely met with elsewhere. It is profusely illustrated and the author who produced already *Panoramic India* and *At Ajanta* richly deserves our heartfelt congratulations. It will be an invaluable guide-book to all lovers of art and architecture, for, it gives inspiration and joy and hence we commend the book to all Art studios and students. We also congratulate the publishers on their excellent get up.

R. S. R.

(b). JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Vol. VI, Part I, July 1931. Razan Press, Rajahmundry. Pp. 64.

One of the most interesting results of Indian "Reforms" is the revival of national consciousness among the people of Peninsular India. The great Telugu nation over 23 million strong, traces its history back to the days of Asoka, in the third century B.C., and the Andhra Empire, which ruled over the greater part of S. India for several hundred years after the downfall of Asoka's dynasty. Territorially the Andhras, as the Telugu-speaking peoples prefer to call themselves, at present belong partly to the Madras Presidency and partly to the Dominions of H.E.H. the Nizam. Dissatisfied with the predominance of Tamil influence at the headquarters of the Presidency, the Andhras, a little over a decade ago, demanded and got a National University, and now they claim a Province for themselves. The Andhra Historical Research Society is an expression of the same ideas, and justifies them admirably. In a preliminary note to this, its Sixth Volume, the Honorary Secretary relates concisely the growth of the Society from its foundation by a little group of scholars determined that the Andhras should not lag behind the rest of India in the study of their national culture. A significant item of the Society's programme is the commemoration, by fête and *fest-schrift*, of epochs of national history; thus in 1926 "Kalinga Day" was celebrated at Mukhalingam, the capital of the Kalinga Dynasty, in the British Indian district of Ganjam, and, in April, 1932, a "Kātātiya Day" is to be held at Warangal in the Nizam's territory, the capital of the great medieval monarchy of the Kākātiyas. In the Journal itself the leading interests are historical and linguistic, and the systematic publication of copper plate grants is a most valuable contribution to Indian research. Folklore, so far, has not come within its purview, an omission which it is hoped the Society will before long see its way to supply, for popular belief and practice and social institutions are vital factors in national life.

F. J. RICHARDS.

(From *Folk-Lore*, Vol. XLIII (1932) Pp. 353-4

Subscriptions received during the Quarter ending with 30-6-32

(1) *Ordinary Members.*

Messrs.	Rs.	As.
Sankara Rao A.	4	0
Krishna Rao B. V.	4	0
Krishnaswami Iyer Rao Sahib C. V.	3	8
Krishna Rao Sri Mothey	4	0
Venkata Rama Reddi Pingala	3	8
Ranga Reddi Pingala	3	8
Srinivasa Gopalachari S. T.	3	8
Chatterji Nandalal	3	8
Basithkhan, Abdul	3	8
Venkataramaniah A.	3	8
Coomaraswami Dr, A. K.	3	8
Total Rs.	40	0

(2) *Life Members.*

Sri Rajah K. Srinivasa Jaganadha Rao Bahadur Garu	25	0
Srinivasa Gopalachari S. T.	70	0
Total Rs.	95	0

(3) *Subscribers.*

The Allahabad University	6	8
Arthur Probsthain, London.	8	15
Total Rs.	15	7

Donations received during the Quarter.

Sri Hota Veerabhadrayya Garu	80	0
Grand Total Rs.	230	7

N. B.- For back Volumes of the Journal supplied, the following sums were received from:—

Messrs	Venkatarama Reddi Pingala	18	0
	Jayaswal, K. P.	18	12
	Coomaraswami Dr. A. K.	11	1
	Srinivasa Gopalachari S. T.	17	8
	Venkatramaniah A.	17	8
	Basith Khan, Abdul	17	8
	Total Rs.	100	5